

THE

CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. LXVII.—JANUARY, 1852.

ART. I.—THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

*Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde, dargestellt von Julius Müller.
Breslau, 1844.*

WE have placed the title of this work of Müller at the head of our article, not for the purpose of entering into an analysis and criticism of it at this time, but rather, as a strong and convenient shelter under which to labor upon the much vexed and much vexing doctrine of Original Sin. We are the more inclined to connect our reflections upon this subject with this work, in even this slight and external manner, (1.) because they coincide substantially with what we suppose to be the general theory presented in this thorough and thoroughly elaborated treatise, though differing from it, as may be seen, on the point of the nature of the connection of the individual with Adam, and by such other modifications as would naturally result from considering the subject from other points of view, and with reference to questions current among a theological public, differing very considerably from that in the midst of which this work originated; and, (2.) because it gives us countenance in the attempt to investigate the doctrine from a metaphysical, and not merely psychological, position. For it is the misfortune of the theology in vogue for the last hundred years, as it seems to us, that sin has been contemplated in its phenomenal aspects, rather than in its hidden sources. The majority of treatises that have been written upon this subject since the middle of the eighteenth century, have been occupied principally with *conscious*, and (technically so called) *actual* transgression; while sin, in the form of a nature, deeper than consciousness, and the very fountain of all consciousness itself, on this subject, has too generally been neglected. While, therefore, the psychology of sin has been diligently in-

vestigated, and with as much success as could have been expected under the circumstances, the metaphysical side of the doctrine has made little or no progress. If we turn to the treatises of an elder day—to the doctrinal statements on this subject of Augustine or Calvin, or Turretine, or Quenstedt, or the elder Edwards—we find the reverse to be the fact. Here the essence of sin is regarded as a nature or state of the soul, which manifests itself in a conscious and actual transgression that derives all its malignity and guilt from this, its deeper source. With this source itself—this metaphysical ground of the psychological or conscious transgression—the profound intellect and acute speculation of these men were chiefly occupied, knowing that if all the contradiction and all the mystery on this difficult doctrine, could be cleared up at this point, the question would be settled once for all. Instead, however, of advancing in the general line of advance, marked and deeply scored into all the best theology of the past, the theological mind for the last century has stopped short, as it seems to us, and has contented itself with investigating the mere superficies of the subject—ignoring, and in some instances denying, the existence of its solid substance. The effect of this species of theologizing is every way deleterious. In the first place, the problem itself can never be solved by this method, any more than the mystery of life can be cleared up by a mere examination of the leaves and blossoms of a tree. The scientific statement of the doctrine of original sin has made no advance since the statement made in 1643, by the Westminster Assembly. There has been much acute and intense speculation upon the doctrine since that time,—for mysterious as it is, and repulsive as it is, to fallen human nature, it will ever charm like the serpent's eye,—but we know of no distinct and strict wording of the doctrine made since then, that contains a fuller and clearer and less contradictory statement than that of the Catechism. It is plain, that there will be no "progress in Theology" by this route. In the second place, this neglect of the sinful nature, and this fastening of the eye upon the sinful exercises only, is greatly injurious to the interests of practical religion. The attention of man is directed to the mere surface of his character. His eye is not made to penetrate into what he *is*, because he is constantly occupied with what he *does*. The standard of character itself is lowered; while, as all church history shows, the grade of character actually reached is far lower than that attained on another theory and view of sin.

Finally, less unanimity among theologians is the natural result of this neglect of the metaphysical side of the doctrine

of sin. We know that it is one of the most popular of fallacies, that nothing is less settled than metaphysics,—that the brain of a thorough-bred metaphysician is as confused as his heart, according to Burke, is hard. Still, in the face of the fallacy, we re-affirm that nothing but a return to the old ground occupied by the combatants of an earlier day, will enable theologians to range themselves into two, and only two, divisions, instead of the present variety of “schools,” whose name is legion. The questions that arise, and the answers that are compelled, by a metaphysical method, as distinguished from a merely empirical one, *locate* the theologian, on one side or the other of the line; because, by this method, terms are used in their strict signification, and the conceptions denoted by them are distinct.

Suppose, for example, that the term “sinful,” when applied to the nature of fallen man, instead of being employed in the sense of “innocent,” as it sometimes is at the present day, had but the one uniform and constant signification of “guilty,”—would not all who hold and teach the doctrine of a sinful nature see eye to eye on that point? Suppose again, that the word “imputation” were employed to denote the charge of guilt upon the absolutely guilty; and never an arbitrary charge of any sort,—would not all who hold to the imputation of a sinful nature be at one on this point? And yet the loose use of these and kindred terms, and the multiplication of schools in theology thereby, can be prevented only by that method of investigation which passes by all manifestations and phenomena, and having reached the nature itself, asks—is it innocent, or is it culpable?—is this nature as justly and properly imputable, and so, as worthy of punishment, in the case of the individual, as of Adam, or is it not? Here the subject lies in a nut-shell; and while the “yea, yea,” locates the theologian on one side of the line first sharply drawn in the days of Augustine, and the “nay, nay,” locates him on the other side, what is still better, this strict handling of terms leads to a deeper and more satisfactory enucleation and establishment of the truth itself.

For, if a man affirm that the fallen nature is sin itself, and not the mere occasion of sin—is guilt itself, and not the mere occasion of guilt; and also, that all this is as true of the posterity of Adam as of the individual Adam himself, he is not only bound to explain this on rational grounds, but he is driven to the attempt to explain it by the inevitable movement of his own mind. And this was the case with the men whom we have mentioned. They never shrank from affirming that the ultimate form of sin is a nature, that this nature is guilt,

and that the wrath of God justly rests upon every individual of the human race because of it. And when pressed with the difficulties that beset this, and every other one of the "deep things of God," by as acute and able opponents as the world has ever seen, instead of relaxing the statement, or betaking themselves to a loose and equivocal use of words, they stuck to terms, and endeavored to think through, and establish, on philosophical grounds, a form of doctrine which they first and heartily adopted, on experimental and Scriptural grounds. We do not say that they completely solved the problem, but we verily believe that they were in the way of its solution, and that theological speculation must join on where they left off, and move forward in their line of advance. No one age, however wise and learned, can furnish a finished Theology for all the ages to come; but if we would have substantial advance, each and every age must be in communication with the wisdom and truth of the preceding, and form a piece of continuity with it.

Returning to this point of unanimity, consider for a moment the variety of opinions among us in regard to this subject of a sinful nature. What divisions and controversies exist among those who all alike profess to be Calvinists! How little unanimity exists on this doctrine among those who all alike repel the charge of Arminianism! One portion or school teach, that there is a corrupt nature in man, but deny that it is really and strictly sinful. Another portion or school teach, that there is a nature in man to which the epithet "sinful" is properly applied, who yet, when pressed with the inquiry—is it *crime*, and deserving of the wrath of God?—shrink from the right answer, and return an uncertain sound, of which the substance is, that its contrariety to law, and not its voluntariness, is the essence of sin. Again, there are those who are prepared to fall back upon the ground of the elder Calvinists, up to a certain point, but who resolve the whole matter when pressed by their opponents, into the will and sovereignty of God, and deprecate all attempts to construct the doctrine on grounds of reason and philosophy. And finally, there are some who are inclined not only to the doctrinal statement of Augustine and Owen and the elder Edwards, but also to their method of establishing and defending it, by means of the doctrine of the real oneness of Adam and his posterity, in the fall of the human soul. And yet Calvinism is one in its nature and theory. Using this term to denote not merely that particular scheme of Christian doctrine drawn up by Calvin, but that doctrinal system which had its origin in the controversy of Augustine with Pelagius, and which received a further development through

the reformed theologians on the continent, and the puritan divines of England; we may say that Calvinism teaches but one thing in regard to the existence of a sinful nature in fallen man, and but one thing in regard to the meaning of the term sinful. During those ages of controversy—the 16th and 17th centuries—those who held the doctrine of a sinful nature, and of a sinful nature that is guilt, stood upon one side, and stood all together; and those who rejected this doctrine stood upon the other side, and also stood all together. The Christian church was divided into two divisions, and no more. And this, because the controversy was a thorough one, owing to the profound view of sin taken by the disputants on the Augustinian side; the metaphysical, rather than the merely psychological aspect of the doctrine being uppermost.

It is therefore in this connection that we rejoice at the appearance, in this age, of a work like that of Müller, which recognizes a deeper source and form of sin than particular and conscious choices, and invites the theologian to contemplate the origin and essential character of that *nature* and *state* of the human soul, from which all conscious transgression proceeds. Whether it adopt all the views of the author or not, we are confident the reflecting mind that has made itself acquainted with the history of the doctrine of original sin, will find no difficulty in deciding on which side of the great controversy this treatise is; and furthermore, that it is on the whole a substantial advance towards a complete philosophical statement of the theological statement contained germinally in the works of Augustine, and formally in all the best symbols of the church.

In commencing the investigation of the doctrine of original sin, we naturally start from one distinct and unambiguous statement of Scripture; and we know of no one at once so plain and full as the affirmation of St. Paul, that man is by nature a child of wrath. The doctrine of a guilty nature in man is taught either by implication, or by an explicit detail, in other passages in Paul's Epistles, in the Psalms of David, in the Epistles of John, and in the Prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and in the teachings of Christ; but perhaps no single text of Scripture enounces the doctrine so briefly and comprehensively as this. It makes specific mention of the two principal characteristics of human sinfulness. (1.) Its depth; and by implication, its universality; and, (2.) Its guilt. After all that may be said upon this boundless subject, in its various relations to man, to the universe, and to God, the whole substance of the doctrine may be crowded into a very narrow compass. When we have said, that man is *by nature a child*

of wrath—when we have said, that sin is a nature, and that this nature is guilt—we have said in substance all that can be said. The most exhaustive investigation of the subject will not reveal any feature or element that is not contained by implication in this brief statement.

The true method of investigating the doctrine is thus prescribed by the terms in which it is stated in Scripture, and we shall endeavor to follow it rigidly. We shall endeavor to exhibit the Scriptural doctrine of original sin, not by merely reciting a series of texts, and there leaving the matter, but by seizing upon the most significant and pregnant text of all, and rigorously developing it. If we are not mistaken, the simple contents of this one proposition of St. Paul, will unfold themselves by close reflection into a detailed view, and a doctrinal statement that will be found to harmonize also with reason and the Christian experience.

I. This passage of inspiration teaches, that sin is a *nature*. "We were *φύσει*—by nature—children of wrath." The Greek word *φύσις*, like the Latin, *natura*, always denotes something original and innate, in contradistinction to something acquired by practice or habit. Whenever we wish to represent an attribute or quality, as residing in a subject in the most deep and total manner possible, we say that it is in it by nature, or as a nature; and when in our investigations we are brought back to a nature, as a fundamental basis, we think we have reached the bottom.

When we search for the essence of human sinfulness, we find it in the form of a nature in the man. Suppose we arrest the sinner in the outward act, and fix our attention upon sin in this form, we are immediately compelled, by the operation of our own mind, to let go of this outward act, and to seek for the reality of his sin within him. The outward act, we see in an instant, is but an effect of a cause; and we instinctively turn our eye inward, and fasten it upon the cause. The outward act of transgression drives us, by the very laws of thought, to the power that produced it—to the particular volition that originated it. No mind that thinks at all upon sin can possibly stop with the outward act. Its own rational reflection hurries it away, almost instantaneously, from the blow of the murderer—from the momentary gleam of the knife—to the volition within that strung the muscle, and nerved the blow.

But the mind cannot stop here in its search for the essential reality of sin. When we have reached the sphere—the *inward* sphere—of volitions, we have by no means reached the ultimate ground and form of sin. We may suppose, that because we have gone beyond the outward act—because we are now

within the man—we have found sin in its last form. But we are mistaken. Closer thinking, and what is still better, a deeper experience, will disclose to us a depth in our souls, lower than that in which volitions occur, and a form of sin in that depth, and to the bottom of it, very different from the sin of single volitions.

The thinking mind, which cannot stop with mere effects, but seeks for first causes, and especially the heart that knows its own plague, cannot stop with that quite superficial action of the will which manifests itself in a volition. This action is too isolated—too intermittent—and, in reality, too feeble, to account for so steady and uniform a state of character as human sinfulness. For these particular volitions, ending in particular outward actions, the mind instinctively seeks a common ground. For these innumerable volitions, occurring each by itself and separately, the mind instinctively seeks *one single indivisible nature* from which they spring. When the mind has got back to this point, it stops content, because it has reached a central point. When it has traced all these outward acts and inward volitions to one common principle and source, it stops content, because it has introduced unity into the subject of its investigation. When the human mind has attained a view that is both central and simple, it is satisfied.

It is not more certain, that we are compelled by the laws of our minds to refer properties to a substance, than that, by the operation of the same laws, we are compelled to refer sinful volitions to a simple nature. When we see exercises of the soul, we as instinctively refer them to a nature in that soul, as we refer the properties of a body to the substance of that body. In both cases the human mind is seeking for unity and simplicity in its perceptions. It cannot be content with merely looking at these various properties of matter, this impenetrability, this extension in space, this form, this color, and stopping here. It wants unity of perception, and simplicity of perception, and therefore it goes farther, and *refers* all these properties to one simple substance, of which they are the manifestation. In like manner, the human mind cannot be content with merely looking at all these exercises—these unnumbered volitions of the soul. It craves unity and simplicity of perception here too, and *refers* these innumerable, sinful volitions, to a *nature* in man, one and indivisible, of which they are the manifestations.

Again: the argument from the Christian experience is as strong as that from the nature of the human mind, in favor of the position that the ultimate form—the essential reality—of sin, is a nature. Although in the first period of conviction of

sin, the attention of the man may be directed mainly to actions and volitions; and although this may be the case to a considerable extent, even in the first stages of the Christian experience, it is yet safe to say, that the Christian man is troubled through the Christian life on earth, mainly, and permanently, by his sinful *nature*. The reality of sin, for every man whose experience is worth being taken as testimony, is not in particular volitions of his will, but in its abiding state—not in what he chooses to do now and then, but in that unceasing, uninterrupted determination of self to evil. This is the torment of his life—that below his volitions to sin—below his resolutions to reform—even below his deepest self-examination, and his most distinct self-knowledge—below all the conscious exercises and operations of his soul, there is a sinful *nature*, a dark ground of moral evil.

We are aware of the mysteriousness which is thrown over the subject of sin, by the assumption of a form of sin which is deeper than consciousness. But we must take things as we find them, whether they are mysterious or not; whether we can explain them or not. The contents which we are to analyze are given to our hand, and whether we succeed or not in the analysis, they have the same fixed and real nature of their own. And, we may add, the true way to arrive at the unfolding of a mystery, is to recognize in the outset, the existence of all that belongs to it. The true way to arrive at the successful solution of a dark problem, is to retain all the terms of its statement. To throw out one or more of the terms which properly belong to the problem, and in which its real nature is contained, because it seems to be a troublesome term to manage, is to utterly prevent its solution; and the attempt to unfold the deep mystery of original sin, while rejecting in the outset an element that is essential—the sin that is deeper than consciousness, or the sinful nature, as distinguished from sinful volitions—simply because it darkens a subject that is confessedly mysterious, must inevitably be a failure.

Without troubling ourselves, therefore, at this point in the investigation, about the mysteriousness of a sin of which we are not conscious, because it is the basis and explanation of consciousness, and therefore of necessity below its range and plane, let us here now settle the fact, whether there is any such sin.

(1.) And, in the first place, is it not a fact, that in regard to the matter of sin, we do refer all the conscious processes of our souls to something back of these processes? The materials that make up our consciousness as sinners—the innumerable items of which it is composed—the thousands of wrong volitions,

and the hundreds of thousands of wrong emotions, and the millions of wrong thoughts—do we not, as a matter of fact, refer them all to some *one* thing, out of which they spring? Can we, and as matter of fact, do we, continue to chase these innumerable and constantly vanishing particulars, dropping one as soon as we have reached the next succeeding, because the mind can grasp but one thing at a time, and thus lose the mind in an endless series, instead of collecting it in one act of contemplation and reflection; or do we, with David, cease this attempt to number our iniquities, and having acknowledged that they are more than the hairs of our head, (Ps. xl. 12,) with him confess a *one* sin of heart and of nature at the bottom of them all? No man who has had any experience on this subject at all, will deny that such is the fact. Whatever his theory may be, every man does, in his private reflections and secret confession to God, find a form of sin within him which he regards as the fountain and cause of all his particular and conscious transgressions. He finds an original sin from which these particular wrong thoughts, emotions, and volitions, proceed.

(2.) And now, in the second place, is it not a fact, that we are never conscious of this source itself of transgressions, but only of what flows from it? We are undeniably conscious of these thoughts, these emotions, these volitions—of these items which go to make up the sum of our experience—of these various materials of consciousness. But, are we, as matter of fact, ever conscious of that *principle* of evil—that sinful *nature*, to which, as we have seen, we instinctively refer all our conscious transgressions? We have only to reflect a moment to see that we are never conscious of this sinful *nature* itself, but only of what proceeds from it. The evil *principle* to which we refer all these manifestations of evil, remains ever below the plane of consciousness. These manifestations may, themselves, become more and more profound, and may carry us down into deeper and deeper regions, but we find the sinful nature ever below us; as we go down into the depths of our apostate souls, and know still more and still more, of the plague of our hearts, we are all along, and at every lower point, obliged to assume the existence of a yet deeper sin than our consciousness has grasped. We never reach the bottom; we never come, in consciousness, to the lowest and ultimate form of sin; or, which is the same thing, we never see the time when we have become conscious of all our sinfulness, and there are no further discoveries for us to make. The prayer of David is the proper prayer for us to the day of our death: "Search me, O Lord, and try me, and see what evil ways are within me."

"Cleanse Thou me from *secret* faults." A prayer, it may be remarked, that is utterly unintelligible on the hypothesis that there is no sin deeper than consciousness.

This sinful nature, as distinguished from the conscious transgressions that proceed from it, is not a part of our experience, but something which we *infer* from our experience, as the origin and explanation of it. It is the metaphysical ground of the physical—*i. e.*, psychological—phenomena. We find within consciousness, an innumerable amount of particulars—an endless series of wrong thoughts, emotions, and volitions—each occurring by itself; and this is all we do or can find in consciousness. And if we were confined merely to what we are conscious of—if we were shut up to the series of our experiences merely—we should never come to the knowledge of a sinful nature. But when in reflection, and for the purposes of science, we arrest all these processes of consciousness—when we bring this ever-flowing stream of conscious transgressions to a stand-still—that we may look at them, and find the origin and first cause of them, then we are obliged to *assume* a principle below them all—to *infer* a nature back of them all. Thus, this sinful nature is an *inference*, an *assumption*, or, to use a word borrowed from geometry, a *postulate*, which the mind is obliged to grant, in order to find a key that will unlock, and explain its own experience.

"But granting," the objector may say, "granting that, as matter of fact, we do infer and assume, from what we find in our consciousness, the existence of a nature deeper than consciousness, to which we refer the data of experience, and by which we explain them, what evidence is there, that there is in reality any such thing? By your own confession, it is entirely beyond the sphere of human consciousness; and though it may be a convenient a priori postulate, under which to group and generalize the various particulars in our experience, what evidence is there, that there is an actual correspondent to it in the human soul?" We answer: The evidence in this case is precisely the same with that which exists in the case of any and every purely metaphysical truth. The evidence cannot of course be derived from consciousness, because we are seeking the ground and explanation of consciousness itself; and therefore must be sought for in that *normal and necessary movement of our rational intellect*, by which we are compelled to the a priori assumption. We find ourselves *necessitated*, in every instance that we attempt to find an adequate origin for our particular transgressions, to assume the existence of a sinful nature, and this *rational necessity* in the case, is the evidence that we need. When we find that the mind is driven by the *very*

laws of thought to an a priori assumption, and that it is *invariably* driven to it whenever it reflects at all upon its experience, we have all the evidence that can be had for a metaphysical truth—all the evidence that can rationally be required, that the assumption corresponds to the truth and reality in the case. Reason cannot impose upon itself, and invariably teach a truth of knowing, that is no truth of being—a truth of logic and science, that is no truth of fact; and therefore it is, that men will always believe that there is a substance in which accidents inhere, and a nature from which manifestations proceed, though there is no evidence from consciousness for either. The fact, that the human mind, in the exercise of its sober reflection upon the data of consciousness, is *invariably* and *unavoidably* compelled to a given assumption, is evidence that the assumption has rational grounds, and corresponds to truth and reality. If it is not, then a lie has been built into the very structure of the human mind, and it is not to be trusted in regard to any a priori truth. If, when following the laws of thought, and trusting to the constitution imposed upon it by the Creator, there is no certainty that the assumptions which it is compelled to make as the sufficient ground and adequate explanation of its experimental consciousness, correspond to the truth of things, the human mind might as well stop thinking altogether.

And what shall we do in this connection with the sense of guilt? This sinful nature, as matter of fact, is the source of remorse, and the cause of the most poignant self-reproach in those whose senses have been exercised to discern good and evil. Can we suppose that there is a lie here too, and that pangs come into the human soul, and exist there, with no valid reason for them—no real ground for them to rest upon? Can we suppose that all the remorse and self-reproach that has resulted in the souls of men, from a knowledge of their *nature* and *character*, and not merely of their particular acts, was uncalled for, because there is in reality no such nature? Can we suppose that He who looks on things precisely as they are, *knows* that there is no just cause for this mental distress in His creatures?

In addition to these arguments derived from the nature of the human mind, and the sense of guilt, (which latter point opens a wide and most interesting field of investigation,) we may add, that the history of Christian doctrine shows that the church has in all ages believed in a sinful nature, as distinguished from conscious transgressions. The soundest, and, as we believe, the profoundest symbols, all teach the existence of a form of human sinfulness, running deeper than even the most

thorough and searching Christian experience—or, which is the same thing—that the Divine Eye beholds a corruption in man, more radical and more profound than has ever been seen by the eye of man himself.

II. Assuming, then, that the fact of a sinful nature has been established, we pass to the second statement of St. Paul, that man is by nature *a child of wrath*. We pass from his statement, that sin, in its ultimate form, is a nature,—to his statement, that this nature is *guilt*. And we need not say, that in so doing, we are passing over into the darkest and most dangerous district in the whole domain of theological speculation. The recondite nature of the subject, the difficulty of clearly expressing one's conceptions, even when they lie distinct in one's own mind, the liability to push a point too far, the failure to guard one's statements with sufficient care, and many other causes that might be specified, conspire to render this side of the doctrine of original sin one of the most difficult of all topics of discussion. And before we venture out into this region, we wish to say beforehand, that we should regret and dread above all things, to advance any views on this important doctrine that would conflict with the Christian's experience of the plague of his heart—any views that would be in the least degree prejudicial to that profound view of sin which the soul does actually have when under the teaching and influence of the Holy Spirit. We most heartily and religiously acknowledge, that here the Practical must have preference to the Speculative; and we would immediately give up any speculative view or theory of sin that we might have formed, the moment that we saw that it would go, or tend in the least, to disparage a thorough-going statement of the doctrine in a creed, or to promote an imperfect and shallow experience of it in the heart.

The apostle teaches, that sinful man is a child of wrath. Now, none but a *guilty* being can be the object of the righteous and holy displeasure of God. The doctrine of the Divine Anger is tenable only on the supposition that the objects upon whom it expends itself are *really ill deserving*—are *really criminal*. It becomes necessary therefore to show, that that sinful nature of man, on account of which he becomes a child of wrath, and obnoxious to the Divine anger, is a *guilty* nature. In doing this, we shall be led to discuss sin in its relation to the human Will, and to Adam, the first man.

(1.) In regard to the first point, the position taken is, that this sinful nature is in the Will, and is the product of the Will. We say that it is in the Will, in contradistinction to the physical nature of man. One statement of the doctrine of original

sin makes it to consist in the depravation of man's sensuous nature merely. In this case, the Will is conceived to be extraneous to this corrupted nature, and merely the executor of it. Original sin, in this case, is not in the voluntary part of man, but in the involuntary part of him; and guilt cleaves to him when the voluntary part executes the promptings of the involuntary part; and guilt does not cleave to him until this does take place. The adherents of this view insist, (and properly too, if this statement is correct,) that the term "sinful," in the sense of guilty or criminal, cannot be applied to this depraved physical nature—to this (so-called) original sin.

In opposition to this view, we affirm that original sin does not consist in the depravation of man's sensuous or physical nature, but in the depravation of his Will itself. The corruption of the physical nature of man is one of the consequences of original sin, but not original sin itself. This is a depravation of a far deeper and more central faculty than that of sense—a corruption of the voluntary power itself. It is because the human Will—the *governing* power in the soul—first fell away from God, that the other faculties of man are in the condition they are—that the affections are carnal—that the understanding is darkened—that the physical nature is depraved; and these effects of apostacy should never be put in the place of their cause—of that corruption of the Will which is the origin of them all.

But the examination of a single instance of the gratification of a sensuous propensity, is enough to show that sin lies elsewhere than in the physical nature. A man, we will suppose, gratifies the sensuous craving for strong drink. The sin in the case does not lie in this craving of the sensuous nature, corrupted though it be. The sin in the case lies further back, in the Will; and, be it observed, not in that particular volition of the Will, by which the act of drinking was performed, but in that *abiding state* of the Will—that selfishness, or *selfish nature* in the Will—which prompted and permitted the volition. Here, as in every instance, we are led back to a sinful nature, as the essence of sin; and this nature we find in the Will itself; we find it to be a particular state of the Will itself.

But, besides saying that this sinful nature is in the Will, we have said furthermore, that it is the product of the Will. By this we mean, that the efficient producing author of this sinful nature is the Will itself; in other words, that this nature is a self-willed, a self-determined nature. Before proceeding further with this part of the subject, we wish to premise a few remarks upon these terms, "self-willed" and "self-determined."

It is unfortunate for the cause of truth, and especially for the scientific development of the doctrine of original sin, that the term self-determination has been appropriated by the Arminian School in Theology; and still more unfortunate, that the conception denoted by it has been, and still is, such a defective and inadequate one. Both Arminians and their opponents have understood, and still do understand, by this term, an ability in the Will, at any moment, to choose or refuse some particular thing. The Will accordingly, both for Arminians and their opponents, is merely the faculty of single choices—the faculty of particular volitions; and self-determination for both parties denotes the ability to put forth a single volition, or not, at pleasure. The Will for both parties is simply that faculty of particular choices, by which we raise a hand or let it drop—a species of voluntary power, which the horse employs, in common with man, when he chooses clover and refuses burdock.

This is the notion attached to the term self-determination in the treatise of Edwards—the ability, viz., of the Will to resolve this way or that, at any moment, and under all circumstances; and if this is the only self-determination of which we can have any conception, then Edwards was correct in denying the doctrine. So far as his work combats this defective and inadequate notion of self-determination—so far as it seeks to overthrow the Arminian self-determination—it is one of great value. From such a superficial view of the Will, as being merely the faculty of single isolated volitions, and from such an inadequate notion of self-determination, as being merely the ability to choose or refuse a particular thing, in a particular case, nothing but the most shallow view, both of sin and of regeneration, could result. The great merit of Edwards, it seems to us, consists in his powerful and successful resistance of a false theology, rather than in his own positive statements, concerning the nature and functions of the human Will.

In saying, therefore, that the sinful nature of man is the product of his Will, we do not mean to teach, that it has its origin in the Will, considered as the faculty of choices, or particular volitions. We no more believe that original sin was produced by a volition, than that it can be destroyed by one. And if we can have no idea of the Will except as such a faculty of single choices, and no idea of voluntary action except such as we are conscious of, in our volitions and resolutions, then we grant that the sinful nature must be referred to some other producing cause than the human Will, and

that the epithets, "self-determined," and "self-originated," cannot be applied to it.

But it seems to us that we can have a fuller and more adequate idea of the voluntary power in man than this comes to. It seems to us that our idea of the human Will is by no means exhausted of its contents, when we have taken into view merely that ability which a man has, to regulate his conduct in a particular instance. It seems to us that we do believe in the existence of a controlling power in the soul, that is far more central and profound than the quite superficial faculty by which we regulate the movement of our limbs outwardly, or inwardly summon up our energies to the performance of particular acts. It seems to us, that by the Will, is meant a voluntary power that lies at the very centre of the soul, and whose movements consist, not so much in choosing or refusing, in reference to particular circumstances, as in *determining the whole man with reference to some great and ultimate end of living*. The characteristic of the Will proper, as distinguished from the volitional faculty, is *determination of the whole being to an ultimate end*, rather than selection of means for attaining that end in a particular case.* The difference between the voluntary and the volitional power—between the Will proper and the faculty of choices—may be seen by considering a particular instance of the exercise of the latter. Suppose that a man chooses to indulge one of his appetites in a particular instance—the appetite for alcoholic stimulus, *e.g.*—and that he actually does gratify it. In this instance, he puts forth one single volition, and performs one particular act. By an act of the faculty of choices, of which he is distinctly conscious, and over which he has arbitrary power, he drinks, and gratifies his appetite. But why does he thus choose in this particular instance? In other words, is there not a deeper ground for this single volition? Is not this particular act of the choice determined by a far deeper and pre-existing *determination of his whole inward being to self, as an ultimate end of living*? And now, if the Will should be widened out and deepened, so as to contain this whole inward state of the man—this entire *tendency* of the soul to self, and sin—is it not plain that it would be a very different power from that which put forth the particular volition? Would not the Will, as thus conceived, cover a far wider surface of the soul, and reach down to a far deeper depth in it, than that faculty of single choices which covers but a single

* This distinction between the Will proper, and the faculty of choices, is marked in Latin by the two words, *Voluntas* and *Arbitrium*; and in that one of the modern tongues, whose vocabulary for Philosophy is the richest of all, by the two words, *Wille* and *Willkühr*.

point on the surface, and never goes below the surface?—Would not a faculty, comprehensive enough to include the *whole* man, and sufficiently deep and central to be the origin and basis of a *nature*, a *character*, a *permanent, moral state*, be a very different faculty from that volitionary power whose activity is merely on the surface, and whose products are single resolutions, and transient volitions?

Now, by the Will, we mean such a faculty. We mean by it a voluntary power that lies at the very foundation of the human soul, constituting its central, active principle, containing the whole moral state, and all the moral affections. We mean by it a voluntary power that carries the *whole* inward being along with it when it moves—a power, in short, which is the man himself—the *person*.

It will be seen from this view, that the voluntary power in man is the deepest and most central power within him. We sometimes hear the human soul spoken of as composed fundamentally of Intellect and of Feeling, and only superficially of Will; as if man were an Intellect at bottom, or a Heart at bottom, and then a Will were superinduced as the executive of these. But this cannot be so, for man is a person, and the bottom of personality is free Will. Man at bottom is a Will—a self-determining creature—and his other faculties of knowing and feeling are grafted into this stock and root; and hence he is responsible from centre to circumference.*

The Will, as thus defined, we affirm to be the responsible and guilty author of the sinful nature. Indeed, this sinful nature is nothing more nor less than the state of the Will; nothing more nor less than its constant and total determination to self, as the ultimate end of living. This voluntary power lying at the bottom of the soul, as its elementary base, and carrying all the faculties and powers of the man along with it, whenever it

* Since writing the above, we have fallen in with the following corroborations: "*Voluntas est quippe in omnibus: imo omnes nihil aliud quam voluntates sunt. Nam quid est cupiditas, et lætitia, nisi voluntas in eorum consensio-nem quæ volumus? Et quid est metus atque tristitia, nisi voluntas in dissen-sionem ab his quæ volumus.*" Aug. De civitate Dei, lib. xiv., cap. vi. "The Will is in the soul like the *primum mobile* in the heavens, that doth carry all the inferior orbs away with its own motion. This is the *whole* of a man; a man is not what he knoweth, or what he remembereth, but what he *Willeth*. The Will is the Queen sitting upon its throne, exercising its dominion over the other parts of the soul. The Will is the proper seat of all our sin; and if there could be a *summum malum* as there is a *summum bonum*, this would be in the Will."—Burgess' Original Sin, Part III. chap. xiv. sec. I.

"In the Will, we are to conceive suitable and proportionate affections to those we call passions in the sensitive part. Thus, in the Will, (as it is a rational appetite,) there are love, joy, desire, fear, and hatred. * * * So that the Will loveth, the Will rejoiceth, and the Will desireth," &c.—Burgess. Part III. chap. iv. sec. II.

moves, and wherever it goes, has turned away from God as an ultimate end, and has directed itself to self, as an ultimate end; and this self-direction—this permanent and entire determination of itself—this *state* of the Will—is the sinful nature of man.

Here then we have a depraved nature, and a depraved nature that is guilt, because it is a self-originated nature.* Here, then, is the child of wrath. Were this nature created and put into man, as an intellectual nature, or as a particular temperament, is put into him, by the Creator of all things, it would not be a responsible and guilty nature, nor would man be a child of wrath. But it does not thus originate. It has its origin in the free and responsible use of that voluntary power which God has created and placed in the human soul, as its most central, most mysterious, and most hazardous endowment. It is a self-determined nature—*i. e.*, a nature originated in a Will, and by a Will.

It will be apparent, from what has been said, that we regard the Arminian idea of the Will, and of self-determination, to be altogether inadequate to the purpose intended by it. The motive of this school, we are charitable enough to believe, was a good one. It desired to vindicate the ways of God to man—to make man responsible for his character—but it ended in the annihilation of all sin except that of volitions; of all sin except what is technically called *actual* sin, because its view of the Will was not profound enough. And as we wish to bring out into as clear a light as possible the difference between the Arminian self-determination, and what we suppose to be the true doctrine, let us for a moment exhibit the relation of both theories to “the doctrine of inability,” as it is familiarly styled.

According to the Arminian school, the Will is merely the faculty of choices; and its action consists solely in volitions. Self-determination, consequently, is the ability to put forth a volition. Now, as a volition is confessedly under the arbitrary control of a man, it follows, that he has the ability to put forth (so-called) holy or sinful volitions at pleasure; and inasmuch as no deeper action of the Will than this volitionary action is recognized in the scheme, it follows, that he has the ability to be holy or sinful, at pleasure. This is the “power to the contrary,” which even sinful man has, although the more thoughtful portion of the school freely acknowledge that it is never exercised, as matter of fact, except under the co-

* To use a scholastic distinction—it is *Peccatum originans*, and not merely *originatum*.

operating influence of the Holy Spirit. This view of the Will, and of self-determination, then, teaches theoretically, at all events, the doctrine of man's ability to regenerate himself. There is no other action of the Will than that of single volitions, and over these man has arbitrary power.

But the true idea of the Will, and of self-determination, while, bringing man in guilty for his sinful nature and conduct, forbids the attribution to him of a self-regenerating power. According to the Arminian theory, all the action of the Will consists of volitions, and one volition being as much within the power of the man as another, a succeeding volition can at any moment reverse and undo the preceding. But, according to what we suppose to be the true view of the Will, there is an action of this voluntary power far deeper, and consequently far less easily managed than that of single choices. We have spoken of a deep and central action of the Will, which consists in the determination and tendency of the *whole* soul, and of the soul as a *whole*. We have spoken of a movement in the voluntary power that carries the whole inward being along with it. Now, it is plain, that such a power as this—including so much, and running so deep—cannot, from the very nature of the case, be such a facile and easily managed power, as that by which we resolve to do some particular thing in every-day life. While, therefore, we affirm that the Will, using the term in the comprehensive sense in which we have defined it, is a free and self-determined power, we deny, that having once taken its direction, it can reverse its motion by a volition or resolution. If the Will were merely the faculty of choices or volitions, this might be the case; but that deep under current, that central self-determination, that great main tendency of the Will to self and sin, as an ultimate end, though having a free and criminal origin, is not to be reversed so easily. We have only to take the Will as thus conceived, and steadily eye it in this free process of self-determination, to see that there is no power in itself, from the very nature of the case, by which the direction of its movement can be altered. Take and hold the sinful Will of man, in this steady, this inmost, this total determination of itself to self, as the ultimate end of its existence, and say how the power that is to reverse all this process can possibly come out of the Will, *thus shut up, and entirely swallowed in the process*. How is the process to destroy itself, and turn into its own contrary? How is Satan to cast out Satan? Having once set itself, with all its energy, in a given direction, and towards a *final* end, the human Will becomes a current that is unmanageable—a power too strong for itself to turn back—not because of any compulsion or stress from without, be it observed, but simply because of its own momentum—simply

because of the obstinate energy with which it is perversely going in the contrary direction. For the *whole* Will is determined, if determined at all; consequently, when a tendency or determination, as distinguished from a volition, has been taken, there is no remainder of power in reserve, (as it were behind the existing determination or tendency,) by which the present moral state of the Will can be reversed. For this determination or permanent state of the Will, as we have observed again and again, is something very different from a volition, which does not carry the whole soul along with it, and which may be reversed by another volition back of it. When a determination has occurred, and a nature has been originated, the Will proper—the *whole* voluntary power—is *in for it*; and hence, in the case of sin, the bondage in the very seat of freedom—the absolute inability to be holy, springing out of, and identical with the determination to be evil—which is a self-determination.

It will be seen, that according to this theory, the freedom of the Will does not consist in the ability to originate a holy or sinful nature at any instant, and according to the caprice of the individual. It does not consist in the ability to determine itself to good or evil, as an ultimate end of existence, with the same facility and agility with which single choices can be exercised. It does not consist in an ability to jerk over from one moral *state* of the will, into a contrary moral *state*, at any moment, by a violent or a resolute effort. The doctrine of the freedom of the Will does indeed require us to affirm that the Will is primarily and constantly self-moved—that its permanent tendency and character is not imposed upon it as the tendency of the brute is imposed upon it by the creative act; but the doctrine does not require us to affirm, that when the Will has once freely formed its character, and responsibly originated its nature, it can then, *ad libitum*, or by any power then possessed by it, form a contrary character, and originate an entirely contrary nature within itself. All that is to be claimed is, that at the initial point in the history of the human Will, a free and responsible start shall be taken, a self-determination shall begin and continue. It is not to be affirmed, for it contradicts the experience of every man who has had any valuable experience upon this subject, that there is power in the will to cross and re-cross from a sinful to a holy *state*, at any moment—that the Will is in such an *indifferent* state in regard to the two great ultimate ends of action—God and self—that it stands affected in precisely the same way towards both, and by a volition, can choose either at pleasure.

(2.) The foregoing statement, it is hoped, will be sufficient to exhibit, so far as the limits of an article will allow, what is conceived to be the true idea of the Will, and of self-determination, in distinction from the Arminian view of them. We turn now to the relation of original sin to Adam, the head and representative of the race of mankind. There is not space to examine the passages of Scripture which speak of the connection of the individual with Adam. We shall assume, that such a connection is plainly taught in Scripture, particularly in the 5th chapter of Romans; and at the same time, barely call attention to the fact, that the soundest creeds of the Church, and that of the Westminster Assembly in particular, have all recognized the connection. Our object is to see if the views that have been presented will not throw some light upon one of the darkest points in speculative theology.

It will be recollected, that in the first part of this article, it was shown that the deepest and ultimate form of sin is below the sphere of consciousness—that we are not conscious of the sinful nature, but only of what proceeds from it. It will also be remembered, that this original sin, or sinful nature, has been traced to the Will as its originating cause, and thereby found to be a guilty nature. If, now, these two points have been made out, it follows as a corollary, that there is an action of the human Will deeper than the ordinary consciousness of man reaches. If man is not conscious of his sinful nature, and if, nevertheless, that nature is the product of his Will—is the very state of the Will itself—it follows, that his Will can put forth an action of which he is not conscious. And if this be so, it furthermore follows, that distinct consciousness is not an indispensable condition to the origin and existence of sin and guilt in the human soul.

We are as well aware as any body, that a statement like this seems to carry on the very face of it, not a mystery merely, but an absurdity. At first sight, it seems to be self-contradictory to affirm, that the responsible action of a free moral agent can go on in utter unconsciousness of the action—that the human Will can put forth its most important action, (action the most criminal, and the most tremendous in its consequences,) in a sphere too deep for the agent to know what he is doing. On the contrary, it seems to be as plain as an axiom, that knowledge must in every instance precede action—that the Will cannot act without first distinctly knowing what it is going to do. And accordingly, this is the position laid down in the beginning of all the current treatises on the Will.

Now, without entering into any process of ratiocination to support a mere theory, we wish to raise a simple question of

fact. Is it, then, a fact, that man is conscious of all the action of his Will? Is it a fact, that from the commencement of his existence, on and down through every moment of his existence, he is unintermittently *conscious* of what he is all the while doing, as a moral agent? Is it a fact, that the impenitent sinner—the *thoughtless* sinner, as we so often call him in our sermons—is *aware* every moment of what he is about? No man will pretend that such is the fact. Saying nothing in regard to that deeper action of the Will, which we have denominated its determination, no one will say that a man is distinctly conscious of all his volitions even, of each and every one of the millions of choices which he is exercising from the cradle to the grave. Even here, so near the surface of the soul, and with reference to its most palpable exercises, no one will be bold enough to affirm a distinct consciousness in every instance. Volition after volition, choice after choice, is exercised by the *unawakened, unanxious* sinner, with all the unconsciousness and mechanism, so to speak, with which the two thousand volitions by which he lifts his legs two thousand times in walking a single mile, are exercised.*

Take the first sinful man you meet, and say how much of his daily existence goes on within the sphere of self-consciousness. During how many moments of the day is this moral agent aware of what he is doing, as a moral agent? Of how many of the volitions which he puts forth in the attainment of his ends of living is he distinctly conscious? How many of his emotions are exercised in clear light of self-consciousness, so that he has a distinct knowledge and sense of their moral character? Is it not safe to say, that whole days, it may be whole weeks, and it may be whole months, pass in the lives of many men, during which there is not a single instant of distinct consciousness, in regard to the nature of the agencies going on within their souls? And will it do to say, that all this while there is no action of the Will?

The truth is, we cannot lay aside pre-conceived opinions, and look at the simple facts of the case, without being compelled to the position, that there not only can be, but there actually is, action of the Will that is not conscious action, and a vast amount of it. And this too, whether the Will be regarded as the volitionary or as the voluntary faculty. If we believe

* That the action in this instance is voluntary, in the sense that the muscles and limbs are moved ultimately by acts of the choice, is proved by the fact, that the man can *stop* walking. If it were strictly mechanical and involuntary, the walker must go on like a clock until his ambulatory apparatus ran down.

the Scripture doctrine, that man is evil *continually*, we must also believe, that the Will of man is in *continual* action—absorbed in an *uninterrupted* tendency and determination to self. The motion—the *κίνησις*—is incessant. But we know from observation, and as matter of fact, that man is not distinctly conscious of a thousandth part of this process, which is nevertheless steadily going on, whether he thinks of it or not, whether he is aware of it or not. If, now, while affirming, as we must, that there is no responsible action but action of the Will, we also affirm, as we must not, that there is no action of the Will but conscious action, we remove responsibility from the greater part of human life. Responsibility and criminality would, in this case, cleave only to that comparatively infinitesimal part of a man's life during which he sinned deliberately, and with the consciousness that he was sinning. Furthermore, it would follow, from this doctrine, that the more entire the man's absorption in evil—the more thoughtless and unconscious his life became in regard to sin—the less responsible he would be; the more depraved, the less guilty.

But in this instance again, as in a former, whatever may be our theory, we do practically acknowledge the truth of the doctrine of the responsible action of the human Will, even when there is, or has been, no distinct consciousness of it. The great aim of every awakening sermon that we preach, is to bring the sinner to the distinct consciousness of what he *is*, and *is doing*, as a free moral agent.

And observe, the aim of the sermon is not simply to aid the memory of the sinner—to furnish him an inventory or catalogue of his past transgressions—but, in the strict meaning of the expressive phrase, *to bring him to—to bring him to himself*. The object of every awakening sermon, and the end had in view by the Holy Spirit when He sets it home, is to bring the sinner to a distinct self-consciousness in regard to sin—to make him realize the awful truth, that during his whole past life of thoughtlessness and unconsciousness of what he has been, and been about, his Will has been active, and that from the inmost centre to the outward circumference, this action has been criminal; and still more than this, to make him realize, that *now*, at this very instant, his Will is setting itself with a deep, and as yet to him, *unconscious* determination towards evil, as an ultimate end of action. The object of conviction, in short, is to impart to the sinner a conscious knowledge of that sin, the major part of which came into existence without his conscious knowledge, but by no means without his Will.

We need only take a passage that frequently occurs in the

common Christian experience to see the truth of the view here presented. How often the Christian *finds* himself already in a train of thought, or of feeling, that is contrary to the divine law. Notice that he did *not* go into this train of thought or feeling deliberately, and with a distinct consciousness of what he was doing. The first he knows is, that he is already caught in the process. Thought and feeling in this instance have been *unconsciously* exercised in accordance with that central and abiding determination of the Will towards self, of which we have spoken; in other words, the Will has been *unconsciously* putting forth its action, in and through the powers of thought and feeling, as the self-reproach and sense of guilt consequent upon such exercises of the soul, are proof positive. The moment the Christian man comes to distinct consciousness in regard to this action that has been going on, "without his thinking of it," (as we say in common parlance,) he acknowledges it as criminal action, responsible action, action of the Will. The fact that he was not thinking—that the Will was acting *unconsciously*—subtracts nothing from his sense of guilt in the case.

And if there is unconscious action of the Will in these instances, which occur in the every-day experience of the individual Christian, much more should we expect to find unconscious action in the case of that deepest and primal movement of the Will which is denominated the Fall. If, in the instance of the development or unfolding of sin, there is much of this unconscious voluntary action, much more should we expect to find it in that instance when the profound basis itself, for this development, was laid. If there is mystery in the stalk above ground, much more must we expect to find it in the dark long root under ground. The fall of the human Will unquestionably occurs back of consciousness, and in a region beyond the reach of it. Certainly no one of the posterity of Adam was ever conscious of that act whereby his Will fell from God; and even with regard to Adam himself, the remark of Augustine is true—that he had already fallen before he ate the forbidden fruit. This remark is strictly true, and characterized by those two traits in which Augustine never had a superior—depth and penetration. The act of conscious transgression in the case of Adam sprung from an evil nature that had already been unconsciously generated in his Will. He would not have eaten of the tree, if he had not in his soul already fallen from God.

We may, in this connection, add furthermore, that the other great change which occurs in the human Will—viz., its renovation by the Holy Spirit, and its determination to God as an

ultimate end, consequent thereon—also occurs below the sphere of consciousness. All acknowledge that there is no consciousness of the regenerating act itself, but only of its consequences; and yet, even the most careful theologian must acknowledge, that there is action of the Will of some sort in this instance; that the renovating action is in the Will and in accordance with its freedom, though by no means, as in the case of sin, to be referred solely to the Will.

Enough has been said to show, that, unless we would un-clothe most of human existence of its responsibility, we must assume the possibility and reality of an action of the Will, which is unaccompanied by distinct consciousness on the part of the individual man. And this is eminently true of that deepest action of the Will, by which a nature is generated, and a character is originated. That action of the human Will, which is denominated its fall, which lies under the whole sinful history and development of the individual man—which is the ground and source of all his conscious transgression—is, without contradiction, unconscious action. The moral consciousness of man, taken at its very rise, is the consciousness of guilt—which fact shows that the responsible action, lying under it, as its just cause and valid ground, *has already occurred*. If there is any guilt in falling from God, the human soul incurs that guilt in every instance, without distinct consciousness of the process by which it is brought about. If the origination of a sinful nature—of an abiding wrong state of the Will—is a criminal procedure on the part of the soul, and justly exposes it to the Divine Anger, it is yet a procedure that occurs unconsciously to the soul itself. And in saying this, we are manufacturing no theory, but simply setting forth the simple actual facts of the case. There is no avoiding the conclusion, unless we are bold enough to affirm that only that portion of a sinner's life is responsible and guilty, during which he sins deliberately, and with the consciousness that he is sinning.

We have called attention to this fact, that the human Will can and does put forth its deepest action below the sphere of consciousness, to prepare the way for the investigation of the connection of original sin, as found in each individual, with the fall of Adam. If this hypothesis of the unconscious action of the Will has been established, the only serious objection will have been removed, that can be made to what we suppose is the Scriptural statement of the doctrine of the connexion of the individual with Adam, contained in the Westminster Assembly's Catechism. According to the form of doctrine laid down by that body of profound and learned divines, each individual of the human race is supposed to have been in some way respon-

sibly present in Adam, and responsibly sharing in his apostacy from God. The statement in the creed which they drew up, is as follows:—"The covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation *sinned in him and fell with him* in his first transgression." And the two strongest texts which they cite in proof of the truth of their creed, are these: "By one man's disobedience, many were made sinners." (Rom. v. 19.) "In Adam all die." (1 Cor. xv. 22.)

Now it is to be remembered, that these men were making distinct and scientific statements, and their language, consequently, is not to be regarded as merely metaphorical. It must, therefore, be understood in the same way that scientific language is always to be understood—to be taken in its literal meaning, unless a palpable contradiction or absurdity is involved in so doing. In this doctrinal and scientific statement, then, it is affirmed, that all men sinned in Adam, and fell with Adam in his first transgression. This implies and teaches that all men were, in some sense, co-existent in Adam, otherwise they could not have sinned *in* him. It teaches that all men were, in some sense, co-agent in Adam, otherwise they could not have fallen *with* him. The mode of this co-existence and co-agency of the whole human race in the first man, they do not, it is true, attempt to set forth; but their language distinctly implies that they believed there was such a co-existence and co-agency, whether it could be explained or not. They regarded Adam not merely as an individual, but as a common person; as having a generic as well as individual character. They taught that he was substantially the race of mankind, and that his whole posterity existed in him. Consequently, whatever befell Adam, befell the race. In Adam's fall, the race fell. And what is to be particularly noted is, that they did not regard the fall of Adam, considered as an individual, as any more guilty than the fall of each and every one of his posterity, or that original sin was any the less guilt in his posterity than it was in him. So far as responsibility was concerned, Adam and his posterity were all *alike* guilty of apostacy. They were all involved in a common condemnation, because they were all *alike* concurrent in the fall. The *race* fell in Adam, and consequently each individual of the race was in some mysterious, yet real manner, existent in this common parent of all.

It is on this ground that they taught that original sin is real sin—is guilt. The sinful nature they held, could be properly charged upon every child of Adam, as a nature for

which he, and not his Creator,* was responsible, and which rendered him obnoxious to the eternal displeasure of God—even though, as in the case of infants dying before the dawn of self-consciousness, this nature should never have manifested itself in conscious transgression. Every child of Adam fell from God, in Adam, and in company with Adam, and therefore is justly chargeable with all that Adam is chargeable with, and precisely on the same grounds, viz., on the ground that his fall was not necessitated, but self-determined. For the Will of Adam was not the Will of a single isolated individual merely: it was also, and besides this, the Will of the human species—the human Will generically. If he fell freely, so did his posterity—yet not one after another, and each by himself, as the series of individuals in which the one seminal human nature manifests itself, were born into the world, but all together and all at once, in that first transgression, which stands a most awful and awfully pregnant event at the beginning of human history.

The aim of the Westminster symbol accordingly, and, it may be added, of all the creeds on the Augustinian side of the controversy, was to combine two elements, each having truth in it—to teach the fall of the human race as a unity, and, at the same time, recognize the existence, freedom, and guilt of the individual in the fall. Accordingly they locate the individual in Adam, and make him, in some mysterious but real manner, a responsible partaker in Adam's sin—a guilty sharer, and, in some solid sense of the word, *co-agent* in a common apostacy. As proof of this assertion, we shall quote from a few of the leading authors on this side of the great controversy.

Augustine, although the first to philosophize upon this difficult point, in order to bring it within the limits of a doctrinal system, has, nevertheless, as it seems to us, not been excelled by any of his successors in the profundity and comprehensiveness of his views. He is explicit in teaching the oneness of the human race in Adam, and of the fall of Adam and his posterity in the first transgression. In his work on the desert and remission of sin, he says: "All men at that time sinned in Adam, since, in his nature, all men were as yet that one man."† And the sentiment is repeated still more distinctly in that most elaborate of his treatises—*De Civitate Dei*; a work which was the fruit of mature reason, and ripe Christian experience, and which, notwithstanding the crudity of some of its speculations on subjects pertaining to the sensuous nature of man, and to

* Nor Adam, considered as an *individual* merely.

† In Adamo omnes tunc peccaverunt. quando in ejus natura adhuc omnes ille unus fuerunt.—*De pec. mer. et rem.* iii. 7.

physical nature generally, is unrivalled for the depth and clearness of its insight into all that is distinctively and purely spiritual. "We were all *in* that one man, since we *were* all that one man, who lapsed into sin through that woman, who was made from him previous to transgression. The form in which we were to live as individuals had not been created and assigned to us, man by man, but that seminal nature was in existence, from which we were to be propagated."* In the words of Neander, "Augustine supposed not only that that bondage, under the principle of sin, by which sin is its own punishment, was transmitted by the progenitor of the human race to his posterity: but also that the first transgression, as an act, was to be imputed to the whole human race—that the guilt and the penalty were propagated from one to all. This participation of all in Adam's transgression, Augustine made clear to his own mind in this way: Adam was the representative of the whole race, and bore in himself the entire human nature and kind, in germ, since it was from him that it unfolded itself. And this theory would easily blend with Augustine's speculative form of thought, as he had appropriated to himself the Platonico-Aristotelian realism, in the doctrine of general conceptions, *and conceived of general conceptions as the original types of the kind realized in individual things.*†"

Calvin, though not so explicit as his predecessor Augustine, or as some of his successors, in regard to the precise nature of the individual's connection with Adam, yet leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader that he believed in the original oneness of Adam and his posterity, in the act of apostacy. He says: "It is certain that Adam was not only the progenitor, but, as it were, the root of mankind, and therefore all the race were necessarily vitiated in his corruption." Again he says: "He who pronounces that we were all dead in Adam, does also, at the same time, plainly declare that we were implicated in the guilt of his sin. For no condemnation could reach those who were perfectly clear from all charge of iniquity," [as Adam's posterity would be, were each and every man merely a distinct and isolated individual, existing entirely by himself.] Again he says: "No other explanation, therefore, can be given of our being said to be in Adam, than that his transgression not only procured misery and ruin for himself, but also precipitated our

* Omnes enim fuimus in illo uno, quando omnes fuimus ille unus, qui per feminam lapsus est in peccatum, quæ de illo facta est ante peccatum, Nondum erat nobis singillatim creata et distributa forma, in qua singuli viveremus; sed jam natura erat seminalis ex qua propagaremur.—*De Civ. Dei.* xiii. 14.

† Torrey's Neander, ii. 609.

nature into similar destruction; and that not by his personal guilt as an individual, which pertains not to us, but because he infected all his descendants with the corruption into which he had fallen."*

John Owen is more explicit still, and he unquestionably reflects the views of the Westminster divines, to say nothing of his general profundity and clearness on all points of systematic theology. In his treatise, entitled "A Display of Arminianism,"† in connection with some other answers to the objection that original sin is not voluntary, and therefore cannot be sin, in the sense of guilt, he expressly affirms that it is voluntary, in some sense of that word—that it has the element of free self-determination in it. "But, thirdly," he says, "in respect to our wills, we are not thus innocent neither, for we all sinned in Adam, as the apostle affirmeth. Now all sin is voluntary, say the remonstrants, [the party whom Owen was opposing, but whose statement in this case he was willing to grant,] and therefore Adam's transgression was our voluntary sin also, and that in divers respects; *first*, in that his voluntary act is imputed to us as ours, by reason of the covenant which was made with him in our behalf; but because this consisting in an imputation, must needs be extrinsical to us; therefore, *secondly*, we say that Adam, being the root and head of all human kind, and we all branches from that root, all parts of that body whereof he was the head, his will may be said to be ours; we were then all that one man, (*omnes eramus unus ille homo*, Aug.,) we were all in him, and had no other will but his; so that though that (*viz.*, Adam's will) be extrinsical unto us, considered as particular persons, yet it (*viz.*, Adam's will) is intrinsical, as we are all parts of one common nature; as in him we sinned, so in him we had a will of sinning." In a passage in his "*Vindiciæ Evangelicæ*,"‡ he also says, "By Adam sin entered into the world, so that all sinned in him, and are made sinners thereby—so that also his sin is called the 'sin of the world;' in him all mankind sinned, and his sin is imputed to them."

One more quotation shall suffice, in corroboration of the view presented of the oneness of Adam and his posterity, in respect both to the act and the guilt of apostacy, and this shall be from Jonathan Edwards. In his treatise upon original sin, after citing the passage, "By one man sin entered into the world," he adds, "this passage implies that sin became *universal*

* Institutes—Book ii., chap. i. Allen's Trans.

† Works, V. 127. Russell's Ed.

‡ Works, VIII. p. 222. Russell's Ed.

in the world, and not merely (which would be a trifling, insignificant assertion) that one man, who was made first, sinned first, before other men sinned; or that it did not so happen that many men began to sin just together at the same moment." The latter part of the verse (he goes on to say) "and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, shows that, in the eye of the Judge of the world, in Adam's first sin *all* sinned; not only *in some sort*, but all sinned *so* as to be exposed to that *death* and final destruction, which is the proper *wages of sin*."* In the third chapter of this treatise he combats the objection made against the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity—"that such imputation is unjust and unreasonable, inasmuch as Adam and his posterity are not one and the same," (one of the principal objections to the doctrine, and a fatal one, if it can be maintained.) He combats it by denying the truth of the affirmation, that Adam and his posterity are not one and the same, and by establishing the contrary position by as profound and truthful a course of speculation as ever emanated from his mind. "I think" (he says) "it would go far towards directing us to the more clear and distinct conceiving and right stating of this affair, (of original sin,) were we steadily to bear this in mind: that God, in each step of his proceeding with Adam, in relation to the covenant or constitution established with him, looked on his posterity as being *one with him*. * * * Therefore, I am humbly of opinion, that if any have supposed the children of Adam to come into the world with a *double guilt*: one, the guilt of Adam's sin; another, the guilt arising from their having a corrupt heart, they have not so well conceived of the matter. The *guilt* a man has on his soul at his first existence is one and simple, viz., the guilt of the original apostacy, the guilt of the sin by which the species first rebelled from God. * * The *first existing* of a corrupt disposition in the hearts of Adam's posterity is not to be looked upon as sin belonging to them, *distinct* from their participation of Adam's first sin: it is, as it were, the *extended pollution* of that sin, through the whole tree, by virtue of the constituted *union* of the branches with the root; or the *inherence* of the sin of that head of the species in the members, in the consent and concurrence of the hearts of the members, with the head in that first act." Edwards also quotes with approbation the following from Stapfer: "It is objected against the imputation of Adam's sin, that we never committed the same sin with Adam, neither in number nor in

* The italics are Edwards's, and the italics of Edwards are always significant.

kind. I answer, we should distinguish here between the physical act itself, which Adam committed, and the morality of the action and consent to it. If we have respect only to the external act, to be sure it must be confessed that Adam's posterity did not put forth their hands to the forbidden fruit: in which sense that act of transgression, and that fall of Adam, cannot be physically one with the sin of his posterity. But if we consider the morality of the action, [*i. e.*, the voluntary ground of it,] and what consent there is to it, it is altogether to be maintained that his posterity committed the same sin both in number and in kind, inasmuch as they are to be looked upon as consenting to it: for where there is a consent to a sin, there the same sin is committed. Seeing, therefore, that Adam, with all his posterity, constitute but one moral person, and are united in the same covenant, and are transgressors of the same law, they are also to be looked upon as having, in a moral estimation, committed the same transgression of the law both in manner and in kind." Edwards finally remarks, that all the objections that can be brought against the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, are summed up in this assumption and assertion—that Adam and his posterity are *not one*, but entirely *distinct agents*: this assumption he earnestly denies, and enters into a long and subtle investigation, well worthy any man's study, of what is meant by personal identity, to show that there is no absurdity or contradiction in the hypothesis, that, by the divine establishment and constitution, all of Adam's posterity were, in some real and important sense, in him and one with him.

Any one who will take the pains to study the history of the doctrine of original sin, and to trace its development, will find that the more profound minds in the Christian church have ever sought to relieve the subject of those difficulties which encompass it, by this doctrine of the oneness of Adam with his posterity. A mystery overhangs, and, perhaps, ever must overhang the nature and possibility of this oneness; but this mystery being once waived, or put up with by the mind, the principal difficulties that beset the doctrine of a sinful nature originated antecedently to all consciousness, and beginning to manifest itself in the case of every individual with the first dawn of self-consciousness, disappear. Granting the possibility and the fact of the individual's fall in Adam and with Adam, then it is easy to see how this fall can be charged as guilt upon the individual, and the sinful nature be truly and really a self-determined and responsible nature, deserving and incurring the wrath of God. Original sin, by this hypothesis, is seen to be the work of the creature, and not the Creator, the chief peculiarity in the case

being, that it was originated by the whole race, and for the whole race, not as it exists in the historical series of its individual members, but as it existed, a seminal and common nature in the first man.

With regard to the possibility of such a co-existence of Adam and his posterity, little can be said, although the more the mind reflects upon the subject, the less surprising does it seem. One thing is certain, that the mysteriousness of the subject has not deterred the human mind from receiving the doctrine. We see the clearest and deepest minds of the church—men of unquestioned intellectual power, and of profound insight into their own hearts, drawn, as by a spell, to this hypothesis, as the best theory by which to free the doctrine of original sin from its principal difficulties: and this fact of itself constitutes a strong ground for the belief that the truth lies in this direction.

1. We would merely call attention, however, to the fact, that the doctrine of the oneness and co-existence of the race in the first man, by no means contradicts what we know from physiology, but rather finds a corroboration from it. When the first individuals of a new species are created out of nothing by the Creator of all things, the *species*, as well as these individuals, is created. The remaining individuals of the species—the posterity of the first pair—do not come into existence each by a new fiat, like that which called the first into being, but by a propagation. The primordial elements of all the individuals of the series are created, when the first pair of the species is created, and then are developed into a series of individuals. Any catastrophe, therefore, any radical change that befalls these first individuals, affects the whole species, and in precisely the same way. If that science, whose business it is to investigate the nature and mutual relations of the species and the individual, and to give an account of the development of the creation of God, teaches anything, it teaches this.

2. The other principal objection—that the individual was never conscious of this fall in Adam, has been removed by what has been advanced in regard to the possibility of a voluntary action that is deeper than consciousness. If there can be, and actually is, action of the human Will, unaccompanied by self-consciousness, then it is not absurd or self-contradictory to affirm that the Will of the whole species, including the Will of every individual within it, fell in the first man.

The doctrine of original sin, then, as stated in the Westminster Catechism, taken in its strict and literal acceptation, we deem to be in accordance with the teaching of Scripture on this subject. Only put up with the inexplicability of the one-

ness, and co-existence of Adam and his posterity—only grant this assumption, which all the analogies in the world of physical nature, and all the investigations of physiology yet seem to corroborate—and we can hold to a sinful nature, and a sinful nature that is guilt. We know of no other theory that does not in the end either annihilate sin, by recognizing no sin but that of single volitions, or else, while asserting a sinful nature, does it at the expense of human freedom and responsibility, and thus lands ultimately where the other does. And surely a theory, which removes the real and honest difficulties that cling to one of the most vexed questions in theology, ought not to be rejected merely on the ground of a mystery that attaches to one of its elements. Manifest absurdity and self-contradiction would be the only valid grounds for rejecting it; and these, we think, cannot be fixed upon it.

In conclusion, we would say, that we cannot think, with some, that such speculations into a difficult doctrine, like that of original sin, are valueless—that they merely baffle the mind and harden the heart. We rise from this investigation with a more profound belief than ever, in the doctrine of the innate and total depravity of man—of his bondage to evil, and his guilt in this bondage. It is only when we turn away our eye from the particular exhibitions of sin to that evil nature that lies under them all, and lies under them all the while—it is only when we turn away from what we *do* to what we *are*, that we become filled with that deep sense of guilt, that profound self-abasement, before the infinite purity of God, and that utter self-despair, which alone fit us to be the subjects of renewing and sanctifying grace. If the church and the ministry of the present day need any one thing more than another, it is profound views of sin; and if the current theology of the day is lacking in any one thing, it is in that thorough-going, that truly philosophic, and, at the same time, truly edifying theory of sin, which runs like a strong muscular cord through all the soundest theology of the church.

ART. II.—EPICURUS.

BY THE REV. ENOCH POND, D. D.,

Professor in the Theological Seminary at Bangor, Maine.

EPICURUS was ushered into life at a remarkable period, near the close of what may be termed the philosophic age of Greece. Socrates, the most renowned of all the philosophers, was born at Attica, 467 years before Christ. Thirty-eight years later, appeared his most distinguished disciple and follower, Plato. Aristotle succeeded Plato by forty-five years, Zeno succeeded Aristotle by only eleven years, and Epicurus succeeded Zeno by eighteen years. When we remember that this was also the age of Diogenes and Pyrrho, of Demosthenes, Æschines, and of Alexander the Great, and that these distinguished professors of wisdom, and masters of the world, with many others of like fame, all sprang up so near together on the narrow soil of Greece, we cannot but look upon that classic land, and upon that remarkable period of the world, with admiration and wonder. Truly, that was an age prolific of great minds! And for some reason, the great men of the age all seemed to cluster on a single spot!

Epicurus was born at Gargettus, near Athens, 340 years before the Christian era; and hence he is sometimes called the Gargettian. This was a hundred years subsequent to the latest of the Hebrew prophets, and would make him cotemporary with Jaddua, the Jewish high-priest, whose name is recorded in Neh. xii. 11;—the same who went out, in his pontificals, to meet Alexander, and at whose intercession the conqueror was induced to spare Jerusalem.

The parents of Epicurus, Neocles and Chærestrata, were of honorable descent; but having been reduced to poverty, they were sent, together with two thousand other Athenians, to the island of Samos, to whom the land was divided by lot. The portion which fell to Neocles not proving sufficient for the subsistence of his family, he assumed the profession of a schoolmaster. His wife, meanwhile, took upon her the less honorable, but perhaps more lucrative, profession of an exorcist, and was much occupied in expelling demons from infested houses, and from diseased persons,—an employment in which she was essentially aided by her son.

The island of Samos, it is well known, was sacred to Juno. Here stood her magnificent temple, surrounded with votaries, among whom none were more constant and zealous than Epicurus and his mother. The pomp of the ceremonies, the

melody of the songs, the vast concourse of people who resorted thither from all parts of Greece, together with the supposed awful presence of the goddess, made a deep impression upon the young heart of Epicurus, and inspired him with sentiments of religion, which his future speculations could hardly efface.

Epicurus was naturally inquisitive and fond of learning; and while at school an incident occurred, which directed his thoughts to the study of philosophy. His master was expounding a verse in Hesiod respecting the origin of chaos, when Epicurus asked, "What is chaos?" The master being unable to answer the question, referred him to the philosophers: "It belongs to them to resolve you on that point." "Why, then," says Epicurus, "I will repair to the philosophers, since they are skilled in natural causes, of which you are ignorant."

Epicurus continued at Samos, and at the neighboring isle of Teos, until he was eighteen years of age; in which time he was instructed by Pamphilus in the Platonic philosophy. We next hear of him at Athens, whither he went, in all probability, for the sake of enjoying greater literary advantages. Here he listened to the instructions of all the philosophers, without addicting himself to any. He heard Xenocrates in the Academy and Theophrastus in the Lyceum, and Nausiphanes the Pythagorean, and Pyrrho the sceptic. It follows from these statements that he was not (what he afterwards boasted) an altogether *self-taught* philosopher. He may have been self-taught, so far as his own peculiarities were concerned, while it is certain that he had the best opportunities, and that too in early life, to make himself acquainted with the teachings of others.

During the commotions which followed the death of Alexander, Epicurus left Athens and went to his father at Colophon. He soon after removed to Mitylene, where he first opened a school. The following year he took up his residence at Lampsacus, where he continued four or five years, instructing those who came to him from Mitylene and Colophon. It was here that he became acquainted with Metrodorus and Hermachus, two of his most faithful followers and friends. The latter, who survived him, he constituted his successor, and made him the executor of his will.

Epicurus was now in the thirty-sixth year of his age; and not being satisfied with the narrow sphere which his situation at Lampsacus afforded him, he determined to establish himself as teacher on the more public theatre of Athens. In this attempt he found many things to discourage him. Not only the public mind, but the public places of the city, were all pre-occupied by other sects. The Platonics held the Academy, the Peripatetics the Lyceum, the Cynics the Cynosargum, and

the Stoics the Porch. In these circumstances, Epicurus resolved to secure a situation for himself. He accordingly purchased, at the expense of eighty minæ, (about 325 pounds sterling,) a pleasant garden, where he took up his residence, and where he assiduously taught the principles of his philosophy. Hence the Epicureans were for a long time denominated *philosophers of the garden*. Besides his garden, Epicurus owned a house in Melite, whither he frequently resorted with his friends.

From this time till his death, notwithstanding the frequent disturbances of the state, Epicurus never deserted Athens. He resided there constantly; if we except a few short excursions into Ionia to visit his friends. While Athens was besieged by Demetrius, and while the people were so distressed by famine, that a father and son are said to have fought for a dead rat, Epicurus supported himself and his followers on a small quantity of beans, which he distributed to all alike.

The period when Epicurus opened his school at Athens was, on some accounts, favorable to his design. The older, severer systems of philosophy had fallen into comparative disrepute, while the more liberal spirit of his doctrine, set off by an easy eloquence, a winning manner, and the enchanting beauties of the place, all contributed to render his garden a favorite resort. His school became exceedingly popular, and multitudes flocked to it from Asia and Egypt, as well as from every part of Greece.

But his popularity at this period was not without its accompanying vexations. It excited the envy of the other sects, more especially the Stoics, and led them to assail him with unmerited reproach. Satirical letters were forged and scattered all over Greece, charging him with intemperate living, with licentiousness, with atheism, and with being an enemy to the state.

Whatever may be thought of Epicurus's principles, the first and second of these charges seem to have had no foundation, except in the ignorance or envy of his traducers. So far was he from intemperance and luxury, that his manner of life (as all history testifies) was the plainest and the simplest possible. At the very entrance of his garden was the following inscription: "The hospitable keeper of this mansion, where you will be taught that *pleasure* is the highest good, will present you liberally with barley cakes, and water from the spring. These gardens will not provoke your appetite with artificial dainties, but satisfy it with natural supplies. Will you not, then, be well entertained?"

Epicurus himself is said to have lived, for the most part,

upon bread and water. When he had a mind for further indulgence, he required no more than a little Cytharean cheese, and a single glass of wine. His whole expense of living amounted to less than a penny a day. The following are his own words on the subject: "Thanks be to blessed Nature for having so contrived it, that those things that are really desirable are easily procured; whereas those that are not necessary are hard to be found. Wilt thou support life? Have bread and water. Wilt thou fare daintily? Be hungry. Without this, it would be vain to ransack the market for scarce and costly dishes, whether of flesh or fish. As for myself, a slice of cake and a draught of spring water, make me vie with Jupiter himself, with his nectar and ambrosia, and not in the least to envy him. For these twenty years past, less than a penny a day has kept me. Nay, sometimes I have lessened even that, and do not allow myself so much, that I may find out whether anything is wanting to my pleasure."

The charge of licentiousness, so often preferred against Epicurus, seems to have had no better foundation than that of intemperance. He passed his life in a state of celibacy, and (so far as appears) in strict chastity. He discouraged, though he did not absolutely prohibit, marriage. He discouraged all familiar intercourse with the other sex, as being inconsistent with that bodily and mental tranquillity, which he regarded as the great end of life.

Among the fragments of his writings which remain, we find the three following directions or maxims touching this subject: "The wise man will not marry, nor trouble himself with the thought of receiving, as it were, a fresh being in his children." "The wise man will never yield to the charms of love. It came not from heaven; its pleasures have nothing valuable in them; and if one is unfortunate enough to be overcome by it, he may count it a happiness, if he comes off without mischief." "The wise man should never drink to excess, nor spend his nights in revelling and feasting."*

The charge of Atheism has more to justify it than either of those which have been considered. He denied the providence of God, and may have been a speculative atheist. Indeed, we are inclined to think he was. Still, he *professed* a belief in the gods of his country, was daily at the temples, and enjoyed the confidence of the priests. He claimed that his

* See Digby's *Life of Epicurus*, pp. 48, 54, 56. The Christian Fathers were no friends to Epicurus or his doctrine, yet some of them bear testimony to the purity of his life. "*Moderatus et castus fuit, dum vixit,*" says Gregory Nazianzen.

worship was peculiarly disinterested and holy; for as he thought the gods quite above being concerned with the affairs of mortals, so he professed to approach them through neither hope nor fear, but from an awful respect for their power and majesty, and a regard for the excellency of their natures. "*Deum colebat,*" says Seneca, "*nulla spe, nullo pretio inductus, sed propter majestatem ejus eximiam, supremam que naturam.*"

We have said that the reproaches which were cast upon Epicurus were in part the result of envy. The Stoics envied his popularity, and sought to destroy it by their slanders; but there were other reasons for these reproaches. His theory of morals, making pleasure or happiness the great end of life; also, his denying the providence of God, and a future state of rewards and punishments;—these things were thought to furnish reasonable ground for something more than suspicion. The man who held such principles, it was said, *must* be corrupt, and his school must be one of immorality.

But what gave the greatest currency to the charges against Epicurus was the lives of some, who assumed his name and perverted his principles, for the sake of glossing over their sins. "They were not," says Seneca, though himself a Stoic—"they were not instigated by Epicurus to riot, but being already addicted to vices, they sought to hide their debaucheries in the bosom of philosophy, and ran to those lectures where they heard that pleasure was recommended. Nor do they consider how temperate and abstemious (for such I take it to be) the pleasure of Epicurus is, but fly to the bare name, that they may find some protection and cover for their lusts." It was these men who brought the name of Epicurus into reproach, not only while he lived, but in all periods since. These are the men who have given to the word Epicure its peculiar signification, and made it everywhere a term of reproach.

The genuine disciples of Epicurus—those who were regularly admitted to his school, were accustomed to live together on terms of the strictest intimacy and equality. They were not, in the proper sense of the term, communists. They did not put their property into a common stock: for this, in the opinion of their leader, implied mutual distrust, rather than true friendship. But they lived together in so much affection and kindness, that those among them who had the means, cheerfully supplied the necessities of those who lacked. This, to be sure, was no difficult task, owing to the frugality and economy which prevailed in their community. Still, it indicated a degree of friendship which has rarely been witnessed in this selfish world. The friendship of the Epicureans is thus celebrated by Cicero: "Epicurus says, that of all things which

wisdom has provided for the happiness of life, nothing is more excellent or more agreeable than friendship. Nor did he confirm this by words alone, but much more by his life and manners. What large assemblies of friends, and how strictly united in mutual love, did Epicurus entertain in one little house! which harmony is kept up by his followers even unto this day."

During his long residence at Athens, Epicurus employed his time chiefly in conversation with his friends, in reading lectures to his pupils, and in the writing of books. He is said to have composed no less than three hundred volumes, in all which there was not a single quotation from any author. But what is no less remarkable, not one of these numerous volumes is now extant. Nothing remains, if we except some compendiums and titles preserved by Diogenes Laertius, and a few questions and fragments dispersed among other ancient authors.*

For many years before his death, Epicurus had suffered from that most painful disease, that frequent scourge of the studious and sedentary, the stone. Perceiving from increasing pains, and other evidences of infirmity, that his end was approaching, he prepared his will, which he addressed to his old friend Hermachus, and which is preserved entire by Diogenes Laertius. "Having led," says he, "a most happy life, and being now about to die, we write this to you. We are distressed with strangury and dysentery beyond expression; but all our troubles are abundantly compensated by the pleasure we have in reflecting upon our discourses and inventions. But do thou, as becomes the good will thou hast had for me from thy youth, provide for the children of Metrodorus."

The emperor Marcus Antoninus confirms the account given by Laertius, attesting that Epicurus, in his last sickness, relied more upon the recollection of his past life and his discoveries, than upon the aid of physicians; and instead of complaining of his sufferings, conversed freely with his friends on those principles of philosophy which he had before taught. At length, finding nature to be exhausted, he ordered a warm bath, took a little wine, and having exhorted his friends not to forget him or his doctrines, he expired, in the seventy-third year of his age.

* Although we have none of the genuine works of Epicurus, there are few among the ancients of whose life and doctrines we are able to form a more intelligent judgment. For the means of doing this, we are chiefly indebted to Lucretius, in his poem *De Rerum Natura*; to Diogenes Laertius, in his *Lives of the Philosophers*; to Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch; and especially to Garrendi, in his elaborate work, *De Vita et Moribus Epicuri*.

Epicurus left three brothers, who devoted themselves to the study of philosophy, and were supported by his liberality. Of his intimate friends, the more celebrated were those whose names have been already mentioned, Metrodorus and Hermachus. The former died before Epicurus; but so long as he lived, he maintained the cause of his master with great intrepidity, both in his discourses and writings, and partook largely of the obloquy which fell upon the sect. The latter survived his master, and became, not only the executor of his will, but his successor in the school. The responsibility of continuing and supporting it devolved upon him.

The respect which the followers of Epicurus preserved for his memory is almost incredible. His school was perpetuated at Athens for several hundred years. It was transferred, with the other Grecian philosophies, to Rome, where it continued to flourish to the end of the empire. Nor was it rent, like the other schools of philosophy, by divisions, but the doctrine of its founder was regarded as an oracle. "The sect of Epicurus," says Numenius, "is like a firm republic, which, free from all sedition and dissension, is governed by one common mind and will. This discipline they have ever followed, and do follow it now; so that it is likely it will continue the same in future." It is no small circumstance in favor of these philosophers, that they should enjoy so much internal peace, while the other sects were embroiled with disputes and quarrels.

And the same respect which the followers of Epicurus had for his doctrine, they had also for himself. They preserved his image on their rings and cups; they carried his picture about their persons, or hung it up in their chambers; they kept his birth-day at Rome, even in Pliny's time, and observed the entire month in which he was born as a sort of festival. In short, as long as learning flourished in Greece, and as long as Rome was preserved from the incursions of the barbarians, the memory of Epicurus continued fresh, and his school and discipline were in high repute.

Having said thus much concerning the life and manners of Epicurus, let us proceed, as we are able, to a consideration of his doctrines.

Of *dialectics*, in the sense of Aristotle, Epicurus entertained but a poor opinion. He rejected this branch of study from his system, as being productive only of disputes and quibbles.

In *physics*, he commenced his labors as a disciple of Leucippus and Democritus. Like them, he taught that there is nothing in the universe except material atoms and space, and that these are eternal. Space is the region, the *vacuum*, which is, or may be, occupied by atoms; and from atoms every exist-

ing being and thing are formed. All atoms are of the same essential nature, but they differ in figure, magnitude, and weight. They exist, indeed, in every possible variety of figure,—round, oval, conical, cubical, sharp, hooked, flat, &c. These atoms are moved by an internal impulse, which Epicurus calls gravity. By this internal force they are carried forward with amazing velocity, in a direction which is nearly, but not entirely, *rectilinear*. On account of their *declination* from a right line, there is a frequent concussion of corpuscles of different forms.

It was with reference to this *declination* of the atoms that Epicurus differed from Leucippus and Democritus. The difference seems to have been invented for two reasons: first, to account more satisfactorily for the concussion of the atoms one against another; and, secondly, to introduce more of contingency into their movements, and thus open the way for free agency, as though there could be more of moral freedom in a crooked line than a straight one—in a hap-hazard jumble of material atoms, than in a more regular and orderly motion.

By the concussion of atoms, it is obvious, said Epicurus, that they must be turned out of their natural course; and motions of various kinds, and in various directions, must be produced. The atoms will impinge one against another, until, as Cudworth describes it, “having made successively several encounters, and various implexions and entanglements one with another, they first produce a confused chaos of omnifarious particles, jumbled together with infinite variety. And these afterward, by the tugging of their different and contrary forces, whereby they all hinder and abate each other, come, as it were by a joint conspiracy, to be conglomerated into vortices; where, after many convolutions and evolutions and essays, in which all manner of tricks are tried, and all forms imaginable experimented, they *chance*, in length of time, to settle into this form and system of things which now is,—of earth, water, air and fire, sun, moon and stars, planets, animals and men; so that senseless atoms, fortuitously moved, are the first original of all things.”

According to the above statement, which is on the whole a fair one, all the changes which take place in the figure and other properties of bodies, are the result of changes in the particles composing them. If a body from sweet becomes bitter, or from soft hard, it is through some change in the situation and arrangement of its atoms. “Bodies are more or less rare, in proportion to the magnitude of the vacuities which intercept the solid atoms of which they are composed. Transparency depends partly upon the same cause, and partly upon the position of the vacuities between the particles; for rays of

light will pass easily through a dense body, as glass, if its vacuities are placed in a right line. Hardness and softness, flexibility, ductility, and other qualities, may be explained in the same way. The weight of a body is the result of the weight of all its atoms; and since gravity is an essential quality of atoms, all bodies must be heavy. Heat is the influx of certain small, round corpuscles into the pores of bodies, till, by their perpetual action, the parts are separated, and the body is at length dissolved. The sensation of heat arises from the separation of those parts which before were continuous. Cold is the influx of certain irregular atoms, whose motion is slower than those which occasion heat, and their effect is the opposite of the former. Pleasure and pain, motion and rest, and even time, are accidents of bodies. Production and dissolution are nothing more than a change in the position of atoms, or an increase or diminution of their number.

This world, as a whole, is not eternal, but began, at a certain time, to exist; and the same incessant motion of atoms which produced the world, is continually operating towards its dissolution; for nothing is indissoluble but atoms. The period may return, when nothing will remain but atoms, and infinite space. But in this case, the atoms will be likely to come together again, and other worlds may be the result.

Animals having been formed at the beginning by the casual conjunction of similar atoms, their reproduction is still continued in a consistent and determinate order; Nature having acquired, by degrees, a uniformity in her operations, which appears artificial. The animals were not produced perfect at first. Many of them were so mis-shapen and monstrous, as to be incapable of life.* Nor were the parts of animals originally framed for the purposes for which they are now used; but having been accidentally produced, they were accidentally applied. The eye, for example, was not made for seeing, or the ear for hearing, but being found useful for such purposes, they are so employed.

The soul, according to Epicurus, is a subtle material substance, composed of the finest atoms: For if it were not material, it could neither touch nor be touched, and consequently could neither act nor suffer. By the extreme tenuity of its particles, it is able to penetrate the whole body, and to adhere to all its parts. Sensation is to be considered, not as a primary property of atoms, but as the effect of a peculiar combination

* Epicurus fancied that the first men and animals were formed in certain wombs or bags, growing out of the earth. "*Crescebant uteri terræ radicibus apti.*"—*Lucret. lib. 5, v. 806.*

and contexture of atoms, disposed by their nature to produce it. External objects become sensible to us, by means of certain ideas or images which are perpetually passing from them, (in form similar to the objects themselves,) and striking upon the organs of sense. These images consist of minute particles—inconceivably minute; so that in passing off, they do not perceptibly diminish the bodies from which they come. It would take a long time, according to this theory, to look an object quite out of existence; and yet, in the progress of things, it might be accomplished.

Epicurus did not agree with our modern phrenologists, in placing the mind or intellect in the head. Its seat is in the middle of the breast; and this, he tells us, we learn from our own experience and consciousness. Thought is produced by subtle images, which find their way through the body, and when they arrive at the intellect, move it to think.

Of the affections of the soul, there are only two—pleasure and pain; the former natural and agreeable, the latter unnatural and disagreeable. While all the parts of the soul remain in their natural state, it experiences nothing but pleasurable tranquillity; but from the various motions which are taking place, either in ourselves, or in the objects around us, the soul is liable either to be dilated by the approach of images, suitable to its nature, and therefore pleasant, or to be contracted and pained by contrary impressions. Voluntary action is the effect of images conveyed to the mind, by which pleasurable or painful impressions are made, and subsequent desires or aversions are produced, which become the immediate springs of action.

Notwithstanding his materialism, Epicurus was a great stickler for human freedom. And in order that he might hold it unimpaired, he was led to regard all future events as in the strictest and most absolute sense of the term, contingencies. There could be no previous certainty or necessity in regard to them. He dared not even admit that a proposition relating to human conduct, must be either true, or not true; for this would introduce a sort of necessity. There is a *must* in the case, and human freedom would be endangered.

We have said before, that Epicurus professed to believe in divine natures or gods. But he thought it unreasonable to suppose that the gods, who are immortal and happy, encumber themselves with the management of this world, or are subject to the care and labor which must necessarily attend so great a charge. Nevertheless, on account of their excellent natures, he thought them the proper objects of reverence and worship.

It has been matter of doubt with those who have inquired into this subject, whether Epicurus and his followers really believed in the existence of gods, or not. In the midst of a superstitious and idolatrous people, who were jealous for the honor of their gods, they had many inducements to *profess* such a belief. But the very idea of undecaying and immortal beings, such as they allowed the gods to be, was in obvious contradiction to the first principles of their philosophy. Either the gods were composed of material atoms, or they were not. If they were, then they were subject, like all things else, to decay and dissolution, and could not be immortal. If they were not so constituted, then something exists besides atoms and space, and the foundations of Epicureanism are subverted. Epicurus, it seems, was not ignorant of these conclusions; and we have evidence in his own writings, that his worship of the gods was a mere pretence. "It is much better," he writes to his friend Meneceus, "to join with the people in the *fabulous notion they have of the gods*, than to act, as some naturalists would have us, by the necessity of fate; for the former course inspires reverence, and a man hopes for success by his prayers; but when we imagine a necessity of action, we become heedless and despairing."

Whatever may be thought of Epicurus, in comparison with the other philosophers of his age, in one respect he was more consistent than they. They believed, like him, that matter, in its elements, was eternal; but differed from him in supposing that it was organized by a Supreme Divinity, who exercises a providential control over it. But if matter, in its elements, is eternal, then it is self-existent and independent. Not one of the gods has any property in it, or any right to touch it. What right had they to form a world out of it, and to undertake the government of that world, more than I have to plunder my neighbor's garden? Obviously, the eternity of matter, and the doctrines of creation and providence, cannot stand together. If the former dogma is retained, the two latter must be given up; and Epicurus was consistent with himself in abandoning them.

It is not necessary, at this day, to go into a refutation of the whole, or of any part, of the physical theory of Epicurus. As Brucker says, "it is a feeble and unsuccessful effort to explain the phenomena of nature upon mechanical principles." Indeed, it is more than feeble and unsuccessful; in many parts, it is absurd and ridiculous.

The science of *morals*, in the estimation of Epicurus, was vastly more important than that of nature. Indeed, he regarded the philosophy of nature as of *no* real importance, only as

it is adapted to rescue men from the dominion of fear, and of other troublesome passions, and to lay the foundation of a tranquil and happy life. "If," says he, "what we behold as miraculous in the heavens did not terrify us; if we could overcome the fear of death, because it in no wise concerns us; if our knowledge went so far as to find out the true end of all good and evil; the study of *physical* speculations would be useless and unnecessary. But it is a thing impossible for him, who trembles at the prodigies of nature, and is startled at many of the events of life, to be exempt from fear. He must consider the vast extent of things, and penetrate into them, that he may cure his mind of false impressions and ridiculous fables; for without this, there can be no true taste of pleasure."

Happiness, with Epicurus, was the great end of living; not mere sensual enjoyment, as some have wrongfully affirmed, but *personal happiness*, in the larger sense of the term; that state in which a man enjoys as many of the good things, and suffers as few of the evils, incident to human nature, as possible—passing his days in a smooth course of abiding tranquillity. "Pleasure," he said, "is in its own nature good, and pain is in its own nature evil. The one is, therefore, to be pursued, and the other to be avoided, for its own sake." Again: "pleasure or pain is not only good or evil in itself, but is the *measure* of what is good or evil in every object of desire or aversion. The ultimate reason why we pursue one thing, and avoid another, is, because we expect pleasure from the former, and apprehend pain from the latter. If we sometimes decline a present pleasure, it is not because we are averse to pleasure itself, but because we conceive that, in the present instance, it will be necessarily connected with a greater pain. So if we sometimes submit to a present pain, it is because we judge that it is necessarily connected with a greater pleasure. It is the office of reason to confine the pursuit of pleasure within the limits of nature, in order to the attainment of that happy state, in which the body is free from every kind of pain, and the mind from all perturbation."

This happy state can only be obtained by a prudent care of the body, and a steady government of the mind. The diseases of the body are to be prevented by temperance, or cured by medicine, or rendered tolerable by patience. Against diseases of the mind, philosophy provides sufficient antidotes. The instruments which it employs for this purpose are the virtues; such as temperance, sobriety, continence, gentleness, moderation, fortitude, justice, and above all, *prudence*, which is but a wise calculation of consequences, which Epicurus regarded as the root and ground of all the virtues.

It will help to illustrate the theory of morals adopted by Epicurus, if we give several of the maxims, and other fragments, which have been collected from his writings, by Laetius, Garrendi, Digby, and others.

He discourages a worldly ambition, and proceeds so far as to prohibit his disciple from "taking upon him the administration of the commonwealth." "Some have imagined that regal power and command would make them friends, and have spared no pains to raise themselves to that dignity. But such men have almost always lived in distraction and anxiety, and so have failed of that *main good*"—a tranquil and happy life—"which is according to nature."

In the following, taken from his letter to Meneceus, Epicurus tells us what he means by pleasure: "When we say that pleasure is the main drift of life, it must not be imagined that we thereby mean that sort of pleasure which is to be found in love, or in the luxury and excess of high living, as the professed enemies of our sect would insinuate, who have endeavored to impose upon the world by the malicious construction they have given to our opinion. That pleasure, which is the very centre of our happiness, consists in having our mind free from disturbance, and our body from pain. Drunkenness, debauchery, excessive eating, and other good cheer, have nothing in them that can make life happy. Frugality and tranquillity of mind can alone establish a happy state." Epicurus admits, however, in another place, that "if those who pursue lascivious pleasures could, at the same time, root out of their minds the terror of what is above them, the fear of the gods, and the alarms which the thought of death occasions, and if they could find therein the secret of what is necessary for a good life, he should be wrong to find fault with them; since they would enjoy the most perfect pleasure, and nothing would be able to disturb their tranquillity." We think, on the whole, that Epicurus had little reason to complain that his doctrine of pleasure was absurd. Such a doctrine—however qualified and guarded—will always be abused; and he who propagates it must bear his part of the responsibility.

It follows, from the principles of Epicurus, that there is nothing good or desirable in virtue, aside from its tendency to promote happiness; and this conclusion he boldly avows. "The virtues have nothing in them that can make them desirable in themselves. They are only so from the *pleasure* resulting from them; just as the art of physic is desirable, because of the health which it procures." Friendship ought to be contracted for the *utility* we expect from it; as we cultivate the earth, that we may reap the benefit of its fertility." "Jus-

tice is nothing in itself. Mankind, being united in society, discovered the utility and advantage of agreeing among themselves, and observing certain conditions for their living inoffensively one towards another." "Common right is no other than that utility, which has been acknowledged, by universal consent, to flow from a faithful observance of our mental engagements." Epicurus believed that mankind originated in the lowest stages of barbarism—so wild and brutish as to live without any order or rule. But by degrees they learned the *utility* of laws and contracts, and the necessity of observing them. Hence their first ideas of justice. It was a thing *discovered* and *created* by themselves.

As virtue, according to Epicurus, has nothing good in itself, so vice has nothing evil in itself. The vices are undesirable entirely on account of the troubles which they produce, and chiefly from the fear of detection. "Injustice," he says, "is not in itself an evil. It is an evil only so far as it holds us in perpetual fear, through the remorse of a disturbed conscience, which makes us apprehend that our crimes may come to the knowledge of those who have the power to punish them. It is impossible that he who has violated (though ever so privately) the laws established to prevent our doing or receiving hurt, should be sure that his crime will not come to light; for although he has not been yet detected, he may well fear that he shall be, before he dies." This thought is set forth by Lucretius, the great expounder of Epicurus, in the following lines, as translated by Mr. Creech:—

"Nor can those men expect to live at ease,
Who violate the common bonds of peace;
Though now they live concealed from men and God,
They still must fear 'twill sometime come abroad;
Since some diseas'd, and some by night, betray
The wicked actions they have done by day."*

It hardly need be added, that Epicurus regarded death as the end of man: the atoms of which, both as to his soul and his body, he is composed, are then dissolved; and whether they shall ever be reunited, is quite uncertain. The chances are as millions to one against it. Says the philosopher to his pupil and friend, Meneceus, "Accustom yourself to think that death is nothing in respect to us; since pain and pleasure depend upon the sense, and death is nothing but the privation of

* Titus Lucretius Carus was born 90 years before Christ, and put an end to his life in the 44th year of his age. A philtre or love potion is said to have been given him, which threw him into a frenzy, during the lucid intervals of which he wrote his celebrated Epicurean poem, *De Rerum Natura*.

sense. It is a fine discovery that death does in no way concern us. It is a happy means of passing this mortal life in the greatest tranquillity, without troubling ourselves with the uncertainty of the future, or flattering ourselves with the hopes of immortality." Again, "Death is nothing in reference to us. What has undergone a dissolution has no sense, and this privation of sense makes death just nothing at all."

This is all the consolation which Epicurus could find, or could administer, in the prospect of death. This is all the antidote he could furnish against the natural dread of it. "Death is nothing in respect to us. It is a fine discovery that death does in no way concern us. This is a happy means of passing this mortal life in the greatest tranquillity, without troubling ourselves with the uncertainties of the future, or flattering ourselves with the hope of immortality."

How different this from the soaring, exulting anticipations of the dying Christian! "We know that if this earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day." This is, indeed, exulting language. These are high and glorious anticipations. And are they not rational? Are they not the appropriate fruits of the Christian faith, the legitimate experience of a heaven-instructed and deeply sanctified soul? How low and grovelling, how senseless and comfortless, in comparison with them, are the words of Epicurus on the same subject—words more befitting a brute than a man!

In the foregoing pages, we have attempted a brief but candid account of Epicurus. We have given him all the credit which his friends have ever claimed, for simplicity of manners and purity of life. We have inserted, so far as practicable, his own explanations, and have endeavored to represent both parts of his system—his natural philosophy and his morals—as they were. We cannot find it in our heart to do him injustice. That his philosophy throughout is poor, unsatisfactory, and worthless, we need not say. It is of little value to us, except to admonish us of our own greater privileges, and of the weakness and poverty of the brightest human intellect when unenlightened from heaven. It is when we contrast the sublime truths of our religion with the idle dreams and speculations of the philosophers, that we see most of their value. It is then that we feel most deeply our obligations to them; it is then that the word of God appears—what it claims to be—a *light shining in a dark place*.

**ART. III.—THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE BAPTIST
DENOMINATION.**

BY EDWARD BEAN UNDERHILL, ESQ.,

LONDON, ENGLAND.*

It must, we conceive, be granted by every candid inquirer, that among the evangelical Protestant churches of Europe and America, there exists a general agreement of sentiment on the fundamental articles of Christian belief, notwithstanding the variety of sects into which Protestantism is cast. This denominational separation and action can only be justified on the ground that some important truth is neglected, or receives an inadequate or distorted expression. Not all neglected truth may require this separate maintenance; but only such as relates to the essential elements of Christianity, or to the constitution of the church, which, framed by divine appointment, gathers into itself the subjects of the kingdom of God. Some such truth or truths, either imperfectly apprehended, or marred by human additions, or perverted by error, the Baptist denomination is called to affirm. We may sum up in a few words what appears to be the object of its existence:—Its vocation is to embody in a visible form, as perfect an idea of the will of the church's Redeemer and Lord, as the imperfections of humanity will allow.

While protesting against the errors of Rome, Baptists hold in common with all Protestants, and with all true evangelical churches in every age, the main doctrines of the gospel. The unity of God developing itself in time in a Trinity of Persons, the incarnation of the Son of God for the purpose of effecting, by his vicarious sufferings and death, man's redemption from the curse which has fallen on the whole race through Adam's transgression, the resurrection, ascension, and session of the Redeemer at the right hand of God, the doctrines of justification by faith, of the sanctification of the chosen people of God through the inworking energy of the Holy Spirit by the word, of the resurrection of the dead, of future judgment, of ever-

* The paper now before the reader was, in the first instance, delivered by the author, at the opening of the session of the Baptist Union of England and Wales, in April last. At the request of the Editor, it has undergone some few changes to adapt it to the pages of the *Christian Review*, and to the circumstances of America. These changes have been made by the author.

lasting misery and happiness respectively apportioned to the wicked and righteous:—these and other truths of Scripture have ever found constant and holy professors among the Baptists, as among the great body of Protestant Christians.

Controversies on these topics have, indeed, more or less agitated all Protestant confessions, and in them Baptists have had their share. Some difference, however, is observable in the results of these diversities of opinion. The name of Baptist is not confined to one of the many parties which have been formed among Protestants on these subjects. That designation is given to many whose doctrinal sentiments are very diverse. It is a term under which have been and are still included churches, that maintain views of divine truth which have found special exponents in some one or other of the Protestant sects. Thus, while the Wesleyan church may be said especially to maintain the Arminian view of certain doctrines, and the Presbyterian and Congregational churches the opposite, or the Calvinistic view, an analogous division has taken place in the Baptist body itself, as in the case of the General and Particular Baptists; a division, however, subordinate to those more characteristic principles, which separate the entire body of Baptists from other portions of the Christian church.

While, therefore, the Baptist body as a whole agrees with, or reflects opinions that are more or less prominently held by other Protestant parties, it holds ground peculiar to itself, which from its nature constrains a diverse form of ecclesiastical procedure, and the separate denominational existence of such as adhere to the like views of Christian truth and duty. To two or three of the more characteristic features of the Baptist creed or polity the attention of the reader will be confined. Other peculiarities may be worthy of remark; but neither time nor space will allow of their introduction; nor, indeed, will those selected have that expanded treatment they deserve. On some points, bare hints must suffice; while on all, brevity must prevail. We address ourselves to some observations on the authority of Scripture, on the nature of the Church of Christ, and on the two ordinances instituted by the Redeemer—the so-called sacraments. In these subjects may be found the chief characteristics of the Baptist churches, both of the old world and the new.

One remark may be allowed before entering on their consideration. In speaking of the sentiments that characterize the Baptists, it will be found that their diversity from other bodies is not in every case alike sharply defined. There is a gradation of error, as well as of approximation to the truth, in every church. Some bodies of Christians recede further than others

from the principles of which we are about to speak, while in a few instances there have been a growing enlightenment and a gradual approach to the ground that Baptists occupy. Their testimony for the truth has, to no inconsiderable extent, been blessed of God, and modern times have seen large accessions to the views they hold. While there has been no change in the fundamental principles the Baptist churches, as such, have ever professed, a wide extension of those principles has taken place among other bodies, and in some cases a very near approach to their entire adoption.

ON SCRIPTURE.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century finds its best justification and its chief feature in the triumph of the principle—so long urged by the sects of the middle ages in opposition to the traditions and corruptions of Rome—that the inspired volume of the holy Scriptures is the only rule of faith among Christian men. Protestantism rests, and with it all the parties who recognize opposition to Rome as a common bond, on the recognition of the divine and supreme authority of holy writ in all that pertains to the essence and form of Christianity. But while all Protestant sects unite in a general acknowledgment of the supreme theological authority of holy Scripture, much diversity is found in the degree of their submission thereto, and in the use that has been made of the record itself. By the early reformers of Germany and England, Scripture was in the first instance applied solely to the elucidation of those fundamental truths which constitute the essence of the gospel. Every portion of the dogmatic teaching of Rome was rigidly examined in the light of God's word. Many doctrines and practices were rejected which appeared to them to be directly contradictory to it, or to have no sanction in its language grammatically interpreted. But it was soon found impossible to confine investigation to these matters, and two tendencies rapidly developed themselves amid the agitations of the times. By the one, Scripture was affirmed to be not only the supreme law to regulate the spiritual and moral life of Christians, but to have authority, the power of direction and control, over every part of the ecclesiastical or church-life of the Christian fellowship. By the second tendency, it was declared, that the only safe and proper interpreters of Scripture were men who were themselves spiritually enlightened, whose hearts and minds the divine Spirit had tuned into moral harmony with its revelations and truths. These tendencies appeared nearly together. At Wittenberg and Zurich they troubled the course of the reformers, Luther, Melancthon, and Zuingli. They wrought on to the formation of an unworldly church, to the

rejection of the unintelligent and unregenerate from its fellowship, and to the absolute supremacy of the inspired word over the entire range of man's relations with God, dividing at an early stage of the Reformation the German and Swiss Baptists from the followers of those great and noble men, and ultimately awakening the bitter and prolonged hostility of every Protestant party; the more bitter, that it was evident to friend and foe, that these sentiments were the legitimate and logical sequence of the principle on which the Reformation itself was based.

For the present, our observations will be confined to the second of the tendencies referred to.

The early reformers were all of them of the order of priests. While in communion with Rome, they had been trained for the ministry in the various knowledge then deemed necessary for its discharge. The conflict with Rome brought into powerful play every resource of learning. On the one hand, it was felt to be necessary to unite the new movement with the past. "Reverence for the gray hairs of their ancestors," was a universally recognized law;* and this could only be made auxiliary to the reform by a wide acquaintance with patristic lore. On the other hand, unceasing reference was required to the original languages in which the revelation of God's will was given. Moreover, translations of the holy word had to be prepared for the use of the common people; linguistic ability was required to transfer the divine originals into the vernacular tongues. Hence it came to pass, that the evident utility of the literary habits and training of the first reformers, in combination with the religious and political circumstances of the time, led to the practical conclusion that learned men must be, as they had for ages been, the only qualified expositors of Scripture. Large numbers of men whose judgments and intellect revolted against the corruptions, untruthfulness, and unscriptural character of the dogmas of Rome, became favorers and advocates of the reformation, though spiritually unenlightened. They deemed themselves, from their education and calling, the only fit and rightful ministrants at the Oracle of Truth. Scripture exposition was held to be the peculiar office of preachers "lawfully called." Even "were the preacher evil and a sinner,"† that formed no bar, according to a reformed confession, to the efficacy or value of his ministrations. To this was added an overweening attachment to the opinions of antiquity, until, as in the case of the Anglican Church, the authority of Scripture

* Wirttemberg Confession : *Harmony of Confessions*, p. 16.

† Confession of Helvetia, *Ibid.* p. 2.

was practically set aside, by the determination to submit all controversies of faith to the judgment of the churches and councils of the first four centuries; or, as in the Lutheran churches, the "natural meaning" of Scripture was affirmed to be set down, and that without appeal, in the three creeds of the Apostles, of Nice, and of Athanasius.*

The Baptists arose to protest against this fundamental error. They affirmed that learning was not a sufficient guide to the interpretation of the Scriptures, whether drawn from the great and confused mass of patristic divinity, or exercising itself on the original tongues in which they were written.† True, the grammatical sense of Scripture was of prime importance; but discrepancies were soon apparent between the conclusions of the learned, and the Christian consciousness of minds quickened by the Spirit of God to a spiritual apprehension of the truth, to whom the sacred oracles uttered a language which found a response in their experience, and without which the divine word itself must remain a dead and lifeless letter. Hence the teaching of the Spirit was set over against the teaching of the schools; and Baptists were said to contemn the gospel and the sacraments, because they laid unusual stress on the necessity of a divine instructor. "Never," said one of them,‡ "will the external word change a wicked heart, never make a dead thing alive; else the learned must be the most pious; which was so little the case in the time of Christ, that when the Scripture-learned scribes would delineate the gospel of Christ, they neglect not to represent Him as a rebel, an enthusiast, a blasphemer, a sorcerer, and an arch heretic." "Only those," he adds elsewhere,§ "are in a condition to understand the Scriptures who have received from above a supernatural light, wherein they have a perfect understanding of Scripture, and whereby they comprehend all theological truth." Or, to express the same thought in the language of a great modern Baptist theologian, Andrew Fuller, the Scriptures "present evangelical truth as a holy doctrine, and as that which cannot be understood by an unholy mind. It is the wisdom that is from above, and therefore requires a state of mind suited to it."

It cannot here escape remark, how the objection to a merely learned ministry as such, and therefore to schools in which theology is professionally taught, and the ministry itself de-

* Harmony, p. 12.

† Bullinger, *Adv. Omnia Catabapt prava dogmata*, fol. 9 to 13.

‡ Sebastian Frank, quoted in Schenkel's *Wesen des Protestantismus*, vol. i. p. 141.

§ Ibid. i. p. 140.

|| Works, p. 867.

graded to the rank of a profession, has characterized the Baptist denomination in all stages of its existence. Not unfrequently, indeed, this has led to an undue depreciation of learning, and to a very feeble support of those institutions, in which some necessary amount of instruction is communicated to our rising ministry. This is every way to be regretted. For while it is of the last importance that none but such as are truly converted to God should enter the ministry, there can be no reason whatever, why, when converted, the ministry should not receive the highest practicable degree of cultivation, that it may be in every respect an able ministry, qualified for every department of service and duty. And while pursuing this, we would never forget that the gospel of Christ is pre-eminently a moral remedy for moral defects; that these are universal; that learning is not required to amend them; that without it, the gospel, under the powerful demonstration of the Spirit, can rouse and speak to the universal heart of humanity, with its plainest statements awaken the torpid conscience, and bid the dead to live. It were an evil day for the church and the world, were the Baptist denomination ever to relinquish this testimony, or to confide the deposit of faith, and its inculcation, to the hands of unsanctified learning.

The tendency referred to was further heightened during the course of the Reformation, by the introduction into the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches, not only of very many unregenerate, though learned men, but also by the admission of many to the ministry of the word, whose lives evinced in a very slight degree, and in numerous instances, none of the power of religion. Many testimonies might be adduced to show that a very considerable portion of the reformed clergy was morally unfit to expound or preach God's holy word. The rejection of such teachers formed a frequent topic of declamation against the Baptists, whose complaints led the reformers almost universally to an attempt to establish the validity of the ministry of ungodly men.* It was even made an article of their creeds.† The eminent Luther could venture to assert that the ministry of wicked men was a positive advantage, and by no means to be rejected. He says: "It is no small mercy that God gives us his word by means of knaves and godless men; yea, it is in some measure more perilous when he gives it by the hands of holy men, since the foolish may thereby be induced to depend more on the holiness of men than on the word of God. In this way greater honor would accrue to men than to God and His word. Of this there is no danger when Judas, Caiaphas, and

* Luther's Werke, xi. 454, ed. Walch.

† Conf. of Augsburg. Harmony, p. 298. Ch. of Eng., Art. 26.

Herod preach."* Great indeed was the grief expressed by the pious Melancthon, at the prevalence of pride, and other evils, in the ministry of the church ;† but no effort was made to afford the people more devout instructors in the truth of God : nor can surprise be felt, that serious and thoughtful men, whose minds were illumined by the Spirit of Truth, should seek for guides and teachers such as were taught of God, and whose lives corresponded to the truths they proclaimed. These it was one of the earliest objects of the Baptist churches to obtain. The attempt divided them from the great Protestant parties. It forced them into separation, and gave rise to the invidious reproach that they of all men claimed to be the holiest and best. Nevertheless, from that day to this, holiness of life, and the possession of spiritual discernment, have been characteristic requirements of the ministry among Baptists of every land. No intellectual attainments, no supposed lawfulness of calling, no apostolic succession, however lineal and correct, have been regarded as of equal value, or sufficient, apart from genuine piety, for the work of the ministry, the edification of the saints, and the exposition of the word of God.

We must not pass from this topic without offering the remark, that this spiritual apprehension is not to be confounded with reason. Reason has its claims with respect to religion, and within certain bounds must be employed in deciding the credibility and authority of any given revelation. But this is an intellectual act, and an intellectual act that may and ought to be controlled in its exercise by moral considerations. The decisions of the reason are especially subject to perturbations from man's moral condition ; and what is affirmed in the principle of which we have been treating is simply this, that to the right exercise of reason, to the correct action of the understanding and intellect on the word of God, it is of the highest moment that the heart be right ; in other words, that in judging the meaning and authority of revelation, the mind should be in moral harmony with its Author.

From this same principle proceeds another eminent feature of the Reformation, the affirmation of the right of private judgment, and its correlative, liberty of conscience. If God be the teacher, who shall interfere with the duty, and therefore the right, of resorting to his instruction, or repress the utterance and practice of that which He has taught ? But who does not know, that while exercising these privileges to the utmost for themselves, the reformers of every name and sect denied their enjoyment to all who differed from them ?

* Luther's Werke, xvii. 2675. Brief von der Wiedertaufe.

† Corpus Reformatorum, vi. 325. Scis, me multos annos magnum dolorem circumtulisse. διὰ τῶν διδασκάλων ἀνθαδείαν.

There is no need to recur at length to the annals of history in proof of this.* Long and sanguinary was the struggle the Baptist denomination had to pass through, ere it achieved by God's blessing the liberty it now enjoys. For many long years, the Baptists stood alone the advocates of free, full, and impartial liberty for every man to worship God as God shall teach him.

We now meet in quietude and peace, our fellowship unbroken by the rude irruption of military bands, or robbed of its teachers by the stealthy familiars of the inquisition's power, in the just and rightful exercise of a true liberty of thought and speech—a liberty for which our spiritual, and, in some cases, our personal ancestors passed through "great tribulation." The church they watered with their tears and blood might well be called the "Church of the Cross;" for heavily has the cross burdened its steps until now. And while we rejoice in the freedom we inherit; while we thank God, and offer our oblations of praise to the Redeemer for his exceeding mercy, let not our gratitude be unmindful of the wide progress these principles of truth and liberty have made among the noble of the earth; and more than all, let it be to us a source of unalloyed thankfulness, that Christian brethren of other Protestant denominations, the Anglican, the Presbyterian, the Congregationalist, wiser than the formal creeds to which they yet adhere, have all learned the divine lesson of tolerance and charity, and now fraternize with us in spreading on every side the gospel of good-will to men, and in the maintenance of those blessed principles which once they united to destroy.

One other point remains to be briefly noticed. The supreme theological authority of holy Scripture involves the rejection of articles and creeds as tests of belief. It seems self-evident, that however correctly a given creed, or confession, may embody the truths of Scripture, since it can be regarded as nothing more than a human production, it cannot with reason be held as authoritative in the decision of controversies of faith. Even if we suppose that consequences may be drawn with absolute logical accuracy from the holy text, and approach as far as may be to the certainty of mathematical demonstration, yet, as still owing their statement and form to the human intellect, they must be treated as fallible. The text of Scripture can be the only infallible authority; that is the law, all else is comment. To prefer the comment to the text, in cases of appeal, is to set aside the law, and practically to annul its authority. There appears, however, some propriety in the use of creeds and confessions, as compendious affirmations, or apologetic statements, of the things "most surely believed" among the

* See *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*,—*passim*.

members of a church. But in this case they hold a very different position to the former. Having no pretension to authority, they are not regarded as possessing any obligation. They at once give way before the advancing step of the supreme Judge, and herald his approach. Virtually every Protestant sect, Baptists and Congregationalists excepted, undermines the fundamental principle of its Protestantism, by substituting creeds and formularies, or other documents, for the Scripture, as the judge in matters of faith. Thus the Church of England imposes on its adherents its articles and liturgy, as the only authentic standard of orthodoxy. Where disputes arise as to the meaning of these *credenda*, the appeal is not made to Scripture. Legal and secular acumen is employed to eliminate from the forms themselves the true doctrine, assisted by such light as can be thrown on them from the writings of their framers, or those of the ancient church. In the last resort the supreme governing power in the realm decides. In no case is the appeal to the word of God.* So in courts of Presbyterian judicature, the Westminster Confession and Catechism is the standard of decision, the criterion of judgment, the condemning or absolving law. While in the great body of Methodists, the expository notes and sermons of John Wesley are the ultimate reference, sustained by an unscriptural and irresponsible tribunal, whose regulations have all the force of canons—the power to bind and loose—though they be not the laws of the one Lawgiver in the church, Christ Jesus.

Our testimony, then, on the fundamental principle of Scripture authority is still required. Our denominational position on this topic is simple and decisive. We have still to maintain and advocate, in all meekness and charity, the great truth of the absolute dominion of Scripture over faith and in the church of God. May God grant that in the future our testimony may be as clear and steadfast as in the past!

ON THE CHURCH.

Proceeding from their common ground, the authority of Scripture, the Protestant Confessions, so far as their formularies are concerned, are for the most part agreed as to the constituent elements of the Christian church. It is generally regarded as the aggregate of believers in Christ, whether existing in a militant state on earth, or triumphant in heaven. But it is at once

* Cranmer, the author of the Articles, states in a letter to A'Lasco, in 1548, that the Articles were framed for the very purpose "that all posterity may have a rule [of faith] to follow." In this he followed the counsel of Melancthon. See Britton, on the Sacramental Articles, p. 19.

evident that this general statement has a two-fold aspect. In the one, the church may be viewed as an invisible body, compassing in its fold all the true and genuine followers of the Lamb, and them only. In the other, as a visible body, composed of the same constituent elements as the invisible.

According to the Lutheran* Confession, the church is the congregation of saints and of true believers, renewed in heart, governed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit—a spiritual people, not distinguished from the nations of the earth by rites or laws of a civil nature. The main feature of Lutheranism here predominates—the necessity of faith to the formation of a Christian man. As the saved are those who believe, so, therefore, the church should consist of believers only. But it was held that this description could only be true of the church invisible. Hypocrites and unbelievers, it was said, will unavoidably, like tares, be planted in the kingdom of God. Hence, to form a church that should purely reflect the characteristics of the true church, is impossible. It were therefore at once foolish and wrong to look for a realization of that scriptural idea of the church which the formulary presents. And since the definition is of necessity inapplicable to every existing or possible church, we must be content to adopt such other general marks, as shall suffice in some measure to identify some visible body as the church or kingdom of God. The ground was therefore shifted, and the scriptural idea of the church abandoned. It was enough to say, that the preaching of the true gospel and the due administration of the sacraments, were the only certain marks by which the true church could be known. The attempt was clearly given up to express the invisible reality by the visible. It became not only possible, but also the fact, that while the creeds, formularies and liturgy of the visible church might correspond in all their parts with the teaching of holy writ, they could be employed and set in motion, and be the privilege of persons of whom the normal idea and definition of the church was totally false—that is to say, by persons who were not saints, nor true believers, but enemies of the cross of Christ. It is scarcely necessary to remark how fearfully the departure from the truth, and the all-embracing union that was made of the church with the world, have been visited on the Lutheran communions. We have seen them sink into the slough of rationalism, and well nigh swallowed up in the abyss of infidelity.

In the Calvinistic churches, by which I understand the Pres-

* Guericke's *Christliche Symbolik*, pp. 612, 633.

byterian and Congregational churches of England and America, together with the reformed churches of France, Holland, and Switzerland, the predominant idea of the church is that of an invisible body, consisting of the whole number of the elect, under every dispensation, who by Christ are gathered into one body, constituting the fullness of Him who filleth all in all.* But the endeavor to give a visible form to this ideal led to the same discrepancy as that we have noted in the case of the Lutherans. In some sort it was thought the visible church could be called Catholic. It might be regarded as made up of all single churches throughout the world, whose members were defined as those who professed the true religion, and were bound together by their agreement in some common truths. However alien in spirit and life individuals might be, they were still true members, until cut off by ecclesiastical censure or discipline.† Hence it followed, that the mark of the members of the true church on earth was not, as the theoretic definition would lead us to expect, their divine election, but a mere external profession; and the sign of the church itself was not its forming a part of the elect invisible church, but the preaching of the word of God and the right ministration of the sacraments. These marks were, according to Calvin,‡ sufficient: because neither the word can be preached, nor the sacraments observed, without producing fruit and prospering by the blessing of God. When this takes place, the church appears without ambiguity, nor can her admonitions and censures be resisted with impunity. But in this theory the endeavor to constitute the visible church on the basis of the invisible is again abandoned. The idea of the church as a fellowship of saints, altogether vanishes away.

The departure of the *de facto* church from the normal idea of the Calvinistic confessions, was still further ensured by the admission of the children of its members into the fold. Their election was to be presumed, since they stood in federal and covenant relations with God through the parent, and therefore the sign of the covenant ought not to be withheld.§ Thus it became inevitable that the visible church should depart from the type of the invisible, and in time be in direct contrast with it, since there could be no certainty that the children thus admitted to membership would, on arriving at mature age, manifest genuine piety. Experience and time united, rapidly afforded

* Guericke, p. 621; Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ*, vol. i. pp. 136, 141.

† *Harmony of Confessions*, pp. 211, 216.

‡ *Institutes*, lib. iv. cap. 1, sect. 10—12.

§ *Harmony*, p. 303.

proof that the presumption in favor of infant-election was, in a large and increasing majority of cases, an utter fallacy; so that in a short time the church, instead of being the communion of saints, of holy men and women under law to Christ, consisted in the main of persons whose hearts had never felt the regenerating power of God's word and Spirit.

The pernicious results of this departure from the scriptural and true ideal, were increased, when equal authority was attributed to the legislation of Moses as to that of Christ, in relation to the laws, constitution, and secular aspects of the Christian church. Not only, it was held, ought the church to be a theocracy, a God-governed community, but likewise the state. Could there be for any purpose, civil or religious, better laws, or a more just legislation, than that of God himself, as written by his own hand on the tables of Sinai? And were not the whole people by profession and baptism, the Lord's? Had they not all received, both Jew and Gentile, the seal of the covenant? Why then should they not be governed by the same code of laws with all its stern and just severity? Besides, was it not acknowledged by all Protestants that all Scripture was possessed of absolute and divine authority, in every matter relating to this life as well as to that to come? It was therefore the duty of the magistrate to rule with the rod of Moses, as it was the duty of the minister of God to guide the magistrate in its exercise.* Hence the perturbations, dissensions, and persecutions unto death, which marked the course of the eminent Calvin in Geneva: the prolonged conflict sustained by the advocates of the holy discipline with the Established church in this country, whose partial victory in the days of the Commonwealth threatened to destroy the nascent religious and civil liberty so hardly fought and nobly won; and the disruption we have seen in these modern days, in the northern part of Great Britain, of a large part of the Presbyterian church from its connection with the state, because of legal interference with its internal and divine constitution, without any abandonment of its claim to national and state support.

If we now turn to the view of the Anglican church, as expressed in its Articles, we find a definition, in at least one important particular, dissimilar to those definitions which have

* Institutes, lib. iv. cap. xx, sect. 3—9. Said the eminent Cartwright: "It followeth that even in making politic laws for the Commonwealth, Christian magistrates ought to propound unto themselves those laws [of Moses], and in light of their equity, by a just proportion of circumstances of person, place, &c., frame them" Second Replie, p. 97, ed. 1575. *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*, p. 155.

hitherto engaged our attention ; but in practice the same pernicious mixture of the church with the world. The 19th Article does not recognise the existence of an invisible church ; but at once affirms of the visible church, what the Lutheran and Calvinistic confessions declare to be only characteristic of the invisible. It consists of a congregation "of faithful men." But inasmuch as some doubts may arise on this point as to the true ecclesiastical character of any particular community, "as the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority" in the church, (Article 26,) by which this mark of the true church may become valueless ; the Anglican formulary adopts the general features laid down by the other confessions as marks of the kingdom of God on earth, and adds to its definition that "the church is a congregation of faithful men," the further qualification, "in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance."

It is curious to observe the recurrence of these closing words in the various confessions. As definitions of the Church of Christ, they have no authority from the word of God. *There* the church is always described by a reference to the parties composing it—they are saints—the called of Christ Jesus—and so on, and all these formularies and confessions admit that view of the church by adopting it as the primary characteristic of the Redeemer's fold. But, with the rest, the English Church, in practice, departs from its own ideal. The church becomes simply the aggregate of the baptized, all classes of the people, irrespective of moral condition or character—the entire nation. Thus, the distinction between the righteous and wicked, the believer and the unbeliever, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan, is utterly obliterated. The church is the world, and the world the church : and the church's laws wait for recognition and authority on the sovereign power of the land.*

Not of such a nature is the Baptist view. It stands in broad and well defined contrast to the practice of all other communities. We believe that Christ has on earth a spiritual kingdom, that is, a kingdom not distinguished by marks of worldly grandeur and power, but in opposition thereto. While recognizing that kingdom in its universality, as embracing in every age the redeemed from among men in every nation and clime,

* "We hold, That seeing there is not any man of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth ; nor any member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England ; therefore," &c. Hooker's *Eccl. Polity*, book viii. sec. 1.

we affirm that each particular visible church should be a reflection of the general idea, a congregation of redeemed and faithful men, of saints, of believers, called and separated from the world by the word and Spirit of God, baptized on a personal and sincere confession of faith in Christ, and united with each other in fraternal communion and fellowship in the grace of Christ Jesus. We hold, further, that Christ Jesus is the only lawful governor and lawgiver in the church, with whose administration and laws no secular authority or power should interfere.* What, therefore, every confession, in harmony with Scripture, affirmed the church to be, the Baptists endeavored to realize. They would make theory a fact, and embody, as far as human infirmity could be overcome, the ideal in the actual. They started from the principles of the reformers themselves to do that which the reformers, one and all, inconsistently with their principles, abandoned. Under every conceivable disadvantage, with the whole power of states and sovereigns against them, their views condemned as visionary, in the midst of mockery and reproach, contumely and scorn, with imprisonments and death meeting them at every turn, they persisted in the vocation to which they were called, sustained by the divine promise and the all-watchful provident care of the church's Lord. And the little one has become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation. The testimony they have borne has been blessed of God.

No inconsiderable countenance and support have been received during the last two centuries from the like efforts of the Congregational churches. It is not for us to attempt to reconcile our common views of the constituent elements of the church with their admission of infants to one of its privileges, or to decide for them the controversy now agitating their body, on the principle on which this rite should be imparted. We rejoice in their advocacy of the church's purity, and of its independence of secular control, and would only express the hope, that as on the nature and relations of the Church of Christ, they have been led to the adoption of similar views with ourselves; so, ere long, they may by divine teaching be brought to the recognition of the truth on those few points on which we now differ.

We shall not detain our readers with any remarks on the form, the ecclesiastical organization, the Church of Christ has assumed amongst the Baptists. Such as it is, it has been the result of the elemental law. As in all else, here too the word

* See Confession of 1646. Crosby, vol. i. App. p. 18.

of God is their teacher. They hold that the church's discipline, as well as the church's faith, is to be derived from the church's Lord. Prelatic Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Methodism, regarded as an ecclesiastical organization, seem alike to them to be wanting in Scripture authority. It is, however, worthy of remark, that controversies on the forms of church polity have seldom agitated the Baptists. Whether Scripture contains a settled and complete form of polity, they have scarcely thought it worth while to inquire. It was enough to adhere to the simple directions of the inspired word, ever careful not to lose in the pursuit of forms, or of uniformity, the spirit which can alone render any arrangement useful. Scripture has been found amply sufficient for every purpose of Christian fellowship, to guide in the formation of the fold, in the gathering of the flock, the maintenance of purity, and the enjoyment of the means of grace by which the spiritual man grows and attains maturity. Thus a general harmony of sentiment and practice has been found to prevail in all Baptist churches—for they "all walk by one rule of truth."*

ON THE SACRAMENTS.

We now turn to the last topic on which we propose to engage the attention of our readers—that of the respective views held by Baptists and other Protestant churches on the so-called sacraments.

The views of the great parties into which Protestants are divided, on the meaning and use of the two positive institutions of Christianity, have from the beginning differed fundamentally, and given rise to prolonged and bitter controversies. It is obvious, on a very cursory glance at the formularies and confessions of the different churches, that the doctrines of Rome have on this subject exercised a strange influence—that the Protestant sects but very imperfectly freed themselves from notions of sacramental grace and efficacy, and the trammels of priestly power. The Lutheran churches, under Luther's guidance, maintained with much fullness the original error of Rome. According to them,† God proffers in the sacraments, and communicates to the participant, invisible and heavenly blessings, through the external signs He has appointed. These external signs have secured to them, by the promises of God, an invisible divine thing; and, when rightly administered, effectually and really communicate the blessing to all believing communicants. Thus in baptism, regeneration and remission of sins are infallibly given to the believing neophyte,

* Confession of 1646, p. 23.

† Guericke, pp. 431, 449, 453.

while in the infant heart is planted the germ of faith. In the Lord's supper, Christ, in his living bodily personality, as the God-man, is present. His body and blood, after the consecration of the elements of bread and wine, are actually existent on the altar, and received by the communicant, while in their reception the germ of the resurrection-life is imparted.

These views are opposed by the Calvinistic churches as but little removed from the *opus operatum* of Rome.* On the other hand, the sacraments are affirmed to be outward symbols representing the divine promise and mercy to men, which God's grace and Spirit have imparted to their souls. They are yet more than this. Though symbolic of the divine mercy, they also seal to every believer, to every one in the covenant of grace, that is to say, to the elect, the benefits of Christ's redemption, "so as to oblige them to obedience, to testify and cherish their love to one another, and to distinguish them from those that are without." Grace, however, is not absolutely and exclusively tied to the sacraments: to the non-elect and the unbelieving they are valueless. In respect to baptism, it is God that freely purges us from our sins in his Son's blood, and in Christ adopts us into his family, making with us a holy covenant, and enriching us with gifts of grace. "All these things are sealed up unto us in baptism." *Inwardly*, these gifts and graces are wrought by the Holy Spirit; *outwardly*, they are sealed by water, and by it represented to the eye. The baptized become bound to fight in the Christian warfare, and to render all due obedience to the Lord's commands. Their covenant relation to God through their covenanted and elect parents, entitles infants to every privilege and blessing of the Gospel, which are sealed unto them in the baptismal rite in virtue of their presumed election. In this view of baptism, the Calvinistic churches substantially agree. A portion of the Congregational body in England, however, following Dr. Halley,† deems the rite to be a mere symbol, a significant emblem of divine truth, a sacred sign of evangelical doctrine, illustrative of some important truths of the gospel, and to be administered indifferently to all, without respect to age, character, or condition. As to the holy supper, the Calvinistic churches believe only in a spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament. The enjoyment of blessing or grace is made dependent on the believer's faith; the body and blood of Christ are received only after a spiritual manner by the soul. Faith, co-working with the sign, raises the soul upward into a state

* Harmony, p. 301, &c. Guericke, pp. 438, 462. Halley on the Sacraments, p. 4.

† On the Sacraments, p. 95.

of communion with the Redeemer; but this communion is by no means dependent on the sign. It only *happens* to be contemporaneous. It may, at all other times, be realized by a living faith, without the sign. Nevertheless, the rite seals the benefits of Christ's sacrifice to all believers, and is an assurance or pledge of their acceptance with God. In the practical carrying out of these views, Calvinistic churches profess to baptize the children of believers only—that is, the children of professed Christians, and receive all the baptized to the table of the Lord, presuming their baptism a sufficient guarantee of genuine discipleship. The Congregational churches do not act on this broad principle. With the exception already alluded to, they, for the most part, admit to baptism the children of believers only, understanding thereby those who are sincere followers of Christ: but admission to the Lord's Table is barred against all, even the baptized, who do not evince unequivocal signs of a true conversion to God.* Thus the purity of their church-fellowship is maintained at the cost of consistency; for it is self-evident, that if the baptized children of believers inherit all the blessings of the gospel covenant, it were inconsistent to exclude them from the enjoyment of any part of them. Either a sign is imparted which has no significance, or they are ejected from church privileges whom baptism has sealed as the covenant children of God.

The Church of England belongs to neither of these parties. The sacraments are not, in its view, on the one hand, mere barren signs of God's grace and goodness, but are effectual to work and to quicken, to strengthen and confirm faith in God: nor, on the other, do they become effectual to this end, unless worthily received and duly administered. Two parties, however, divide this church as to the mode in which the sacraments operate. Thus, one affirms that the "wholesome effect or operation" is inseparable from the rite, unless unworthiness intervene to prevent the gracious result; and especially with respect to the Eucharist, the Redeemer is really, though spiritually present, the believing recipient communicating in the precious body and blood of Christ after a mystical and supersensual manner. The other party affirms, that the gracious effect is separable from the rite, though it may be imparted at the same time that the rite is performed, as it is *one*, though *but one*, of the several means and channels of grace appointed for the salvation of men. Regeneration, therefore, is not a special grace of baptism. It may be wrought either by the

* See Wardlaw's Dissertation, in Appendix, p. 283; 3d edition.

preaching of the word, or by the gift of the Holy Spirit at some other time. And as it respects the second rite of the church, the blessings of salvation are enjoyed through faith; yet may that faith be quickened and revived in the presence of the sacred signs by which, as it were, Christ is set forth crucified before the eyes of men.*

It were beside our purpose to detain our readers with any remarks on the question, which of these views accords most nearly with the language of the Anglican formularies. It is, however, our opinion, and one shared in by large numbers of impartial men, that the first view most truly expresses the teaching of the articles and liturgy. The two views are fundamentally discordant; and it can be no matter of surprise that the conflict upon them now agitating the Anglican establishment, threatens its disruption.

With none of these opinions do the Baptists agree. Mere signs the sacraments cannot be, simply illustrative of important truth, since by baptism the convert is actually incorporated into the visible Church of God; while, by participation in the Holy Supper, he expresses his faith in the atoning sacrifice of the Lamb, and his fellowship with the family of the redeemed. Still less are these rites the channels of grace, of regeneration and forgiveness, or seals and assurances of the believer's acceptance with God. We may express the Baptist views, of baptism for instance, in the words of an ancient confession:† "Sacred baptism is an outward, visible, and evangelical action, in which, following the precept of Christ, and the practice of the Apostles, they who have heard the doctrine of the holy Gospel, and have believed, and willingly received it with a penitent heart, are baptized in water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." Or, in a yet later confession, that of 1646:‡—Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, given by Christ to be dispensed upon persons professing faith, or that are made disciples, who, upon profession of faith, ought to be baptized, and after to partake of the Lord's Supper." As the answer of a good conscience, as the solemn confession of faith in Christ, and of adherence to his kingdom, baptism is an act of practical importance and value. A line of distinction is drawn between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan. It is the boundary of the church visible, and the badge of Christian discipleship. Yet baptism is not without an additional and symbolic meaning. Death to sin and to the world is imaged forth in the act of immersion, and

* Articles xxv.—xxx. See Halley, p. 93.

† A. D. 1580. Guericke, p. 479.

‡ Crosby, vol. i. App. p. 21.

a new and holy life entered upon, as the child of God emerges from the laver of regeneration. "It is a sign," says the latter confession just now quoted, "of the interest the saints have in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and that as certainly as the body is buried under water and risen again, so certainly shall the bodies of the saints be raised by the power of Christ in the day of resurrection to reign with Christ."

But inasmuch as neither the initiatory rite, nor the symbol, can find their full meaning and realization in any but the truly regenerate, in them that believe, since baptism is expressive of a real transfer from Satan's kingdom to God's, and a symbol of that final redemption on which faith rests, and which hope anticipates, the rite itself must be limited in its application to those in whom these things are realized. Hence infants, who possess neither the ability to confess Christ, nor the power to comprehend the blessings of salvation, cannot be fit subjects of baptism; and, in opposition to the whole of Christendom, the Baptist churches refuse to perform what must in all such cases be an unmeaning ceremony.

Here, as in former instances, Scripture is the guide of the Baptist churches. On the institutions of the new covenant, the instructions of Christ, by whose blood it was ratified, are held to be paramount and alone. What cannot be proved by the New Testament they reject. They cleave to the simple and determinate language of holy writ. Sacramental grace, and federal privileges, appear to them to have no place in the rule of faith. And on the doctrine of the sacraments, as on other points, they are compelled to bear their testimony against various perversions still upheld by Protestant churches, as well as by the source of all these errors, the Church of Rome itself.

In every stage of the Reformation this testimony was borne. Perspicacious men saw, that in the absolute and theological authority of Scripture, lay the sacramental and ecclesiastical views the Baptists deduced from it.* But the principle covered too large a field for the reformers, and they shrank back from pursuing the course to which God's word and providence summoned them. They stopped short in its application to the interpretation of Scripture itself;—they hesitated to employ it in the ecclesiastical arrangements necessitated by their abandonment of Rome;—they feared for the ark of God if it were not upheld by human might; and the counsels of earthly poten-

* See the opinion of Archbishop Whitgift, quoted in *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*, pp. 195, 196.

tates were more regarded in the construction of the church fabric, its national extension and maintenance, than the might and wisdom of Him "who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords." And not only so. Our sorrow at this departure from the principles the reformers had themselves announced, is deepened as we remember, that the secular arm, on which they leaned, was employed by them to repress every differing sentiment. It did not suffice to garb heavenly truth in ragged tatters of human device and construction. Everywhere the objector was met, in Protestant as well as in Romish countries, with reproach and torture. The streams and dykes of Holland, the market-places of broad Germany, the mountain lakes and dales of glorious Switzerland, together with the Smithfield of Old England, and the settlements of New England, bear witness to the steadfast faith, the glowing and unwavering attachment to the truth as it is in Jesus, the ardent love for Christ, and devotion to his crown and covenant, of the myriads of martyred Baptists, who for their testimony to the word of God, cheerfully, yea, joyously, laid down their lives, "not accepting deliverance." But that testimony has borne rich fruit. Liberty, the free expression of thought and piety in their many forms, has been won. Numerous churches have arisen, are still rising, in which Christ is the only acknowledged head and lawgiver. Modern legislation breathes the spirit of charity, tolerance, and peace; and the agitations which now rock every church, bid fair to place in a broad and unmistakable light the evils which must ever follow, which have so plentifully followed, every departure from the pure words of the divine testimony.

The kingdom of our Lord, though extended and extending, is not yet come: "We see not yet all things put under him." A mighty struggle is evidently impending. Scripture, its inspired and absolute authority, the primary foundation of the Christian faith, is being rudely questioned, and impatiently handled. The traditions of past ages have again emitted their miasmatic mists, like a noisome pestilence, to corrupt its holy truths. Infidelity, in bold yet covert forms, threatens to submerge all human hopes, and even the expectation of immortality, in a flood of spiritualism and transcendental philosophy, striking more or less openly at the historic fidelity of the records of truth, or making them to vanish away in imaginative myths. "It is not unlikely," said the sagacious Fuller, in 1796,* "it is not unlikely, that almost all our religious contro-

* Works, p. 503.

versies will soon be reduced to one, upon which the great body of men will divide. Is Christianity true or false? Is there a God? Is there a heaven or a hell? or is it all fiction? Agitated by these important questions, the greater part of the inhabitants of Europe, and perhaps of America, including our posterity, may rank either as real Christians or as open infidels." Yes, the time is at hand, if not already come. We are summoned by the providence of God to the defence of the Bible. It has ever been the endeavor of Baptists to embody all their Lord's instructions in a practical and living form. They have found his word sufficient for every purpose of religious and ecclesiastical life, and by it are still prepared to stand. And, should another flood of tribulation again overwhelm the churches of God, their pastors scripturally guide and teach—should the principles we have endeavored to illustrate again undergo the fiery trial, doubtless now, as in all past ages, many amongst us will be counted worthy to testify with their blood to the pure word of our God, assured that, in the beautiful and striking language of Hubmeyer, who, in 1528, at Vienna, laid down his life at the stake:—"DIVINE TRUTH IS IMMORTAL: IT MAY, PERHAPS, FOR LONG, BE BOUND, SCOURGED, CROWNED, CRUCIFIED, AND FOR A SEASON BE ENTOMBED IN THE GRAVE; BUT ON THE THIRD DAY IT SHALL RISE AGAIN VICTORIOUS, AND RULE AND TRIUMPH FOR EVER."

ART. IV—UNITY OF THE RACE IN ITS HIGHER RELATIONS.*

BY REV. ROBERT TURNBULL, D. D.,
HARTFORD, CONN.

ALL things are imaged; like "swan and shadow floating double" on the peaceful lake. Face answers to face; the reality and the form, the substance and the shadow, are identical. The one produces the other, and is represented by it. Thus the soul is imaged in the body; God is imaged in nature. There is a sense, then, in which all things as well as all beings resemble each other. Those especially which have simultaneously sprung from the great Fount of being, are alike. Sound answers to sound, motion to motion, force to force, form to form, soul to soul, heart to heart. Unity and variety, the

* Delivered before the Society of Missionary Inquiry, at the Commencement of Brown University, July, 1851.

unity ever gliding into variety, and variety into unity, pervade the universe. Nay, the very idea of the universe, from the nature of the term, is that of endless variety revolving about fixed and central unity.

The same remark will apply to science, which is the human expression or image of nature, as nature is the formal expression or image of God. The one is the thought of God organized or embodied, the other is the thought of God recognized and expressed in human phrase. Thence nature, science, and God, are in harmony. They teach the same things, promote the same ends. Nature is holy, science also is holy; as man, in his true and unfallen state, is holy. So that with a profounder emphasis than even the poet meant, it may be said: "An undevout astronomer is mad." He who reads in the starry heavens, or amid the strata of the everlasting mountains, the clear expression of infinite thought, and yet denies the existence of an infinite *Thinker*, must be deemed not only a moral but a scientific madman. Nature is God's elder Scripture; and science, if true, is its exact transcript or copy. "The heavens declare the glory of the Lord, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, night unto night sheweth knowledge." If God, then, is in nature, God also is in science. "I heard him," cried a great astronomer, "among the stars." True science, like the spheres, is melodious. The constellations go singing through the "blue profound." Kepler and Newton were God's ministers. They assisted at the worship of ten thousand thousand worlds of light.

In a word, Nature is one, as God is one. Diversified in form and aspect, the whole is identical in essence. It has one origin, one cycle of existence, and one eternal end. For the same reason, though in a closer sense, man, the crown and masterpiece of nature, is one in his origin, capacities, and destiny. He is the peculiar product of God, the creation, or outbirth of the Almighty, by which earthly terms we but hint and vainly reach at the mysterious grandeur of our primitive relations. Man has only one aboriginal parent, the Infinite and Eternal One, who breathed into him something of his own ineffable nature. And thus, though diversified in many things external—in form, costume, color, position, attainments, language, all men are identical in essence. "Seeing," says Paul to the Athenians, "he giveth to all life and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood (nature) all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from any one

of us. For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain, also, of your own poets have said, 'For we are also his offspring.'"

Physiologists have found difficulty with the wonderful diversities among the nations, of external shape, color, and so forth; and certainly no theory of physical development, or atmospheric influence, has yet availed for their full explanation. But the diversities in a single family, the fair, the dark, the brown, the red, the blue-eyed, the hazel and gray-eyed, are as inexplicable as the more general diversities of the race. It is well known that the varieties form a scale between two extremes, blending insensibly into one another, and that all belong to a single species, with its fixed limits and indelible marks, and that between all men and the inferior animals, there yawns a wide and impassable chasm. Those who defend the unity of the race on physiological grounds, have made a great mistake in admitting that they are bound to account for its varieties, for the causes of these may lie back of all outward or tangible phenomena, and lurk in the interior essence and constitution of man. Nay, it is conceivable that provision for just such varieties was made in the first human pair, or by some subsequent break, change, or new direction of the constitutional forces. It is unphilosophical to deny a fact fully established, even if we cannot account for its existence, or explain the rationale of its production. There is a limit at which all science is compelled to pause, and own the inscrutable mystery beyond! After all, the great mystery here is not that all men are derived from one human family or pair; for this is just as conceivable as any kind of descent from man to man, or of any kind of diversity in a single household, but that they and all things, with their boundless variety, are derived from one God! How the One becomes the two, the three, the many, the all, or, if the expression be preferred, the One creates the many, the all, is the mystery of mysteries. Even the development-theory of Oken and Goethé, now pretty much extinguished, only pushes the difficulty further back. Agassiz's hypothetical ova, from which, by an amazing stretch of philosophic fancy, the learned professor imagines the primitive earth to have been sown, and from which, by some inscrutable process which he does not venture to explain, may have sprung full-grown races, occupying different spheres as distinct and independent as the fauna of the different zones, leaves the subject, to say the least of it, in a darkness as profound as ever. Nay, it vastly increases the difficulty of the case, involving not only an inscrutable enigma, but what to many must seem a natural impossibility.

All that can be said upon the subject is, that we are the divine offspring; and when we have said this, we have uttered one of the most sublime and thrilling truths. We have said, in a word, that God is in man, and man in God, by a mystic bond; that the human has its root, nay, its essential life, in the Divine. And thus resembling Him, we resemble one another. "The Lord looketh from heaven; he beholdeth all the sons of men. From the place of his habitation he looketh upon all the inhabitants of the earth. He fashioneth their hearts alike."

Let no one call this Transcendentalism, or Pantheism. It is neither, unless we admit that in this view we transcend the outward and perishable, and reach the inward and immortal. Pantheism first denies the personality of God, and then the personality of man. We maintain both. The Bible teaches both. God, though an indivisible unit, is a conscious Intelligence, who manifests himself to us in a threefold, but indivisible personality, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so that we know him as the Fount of being and blessedness, the Creator, Redeemer, and Quickener. So also each man, though springing from God, is a conscious intelligence. Yet man lives in God as the very foundation of his being, and hangs upon him each moment for life and all things. Without God, man is nothing. God is "all, and in all." We are his offspring—as it were, an outshoot from the Deity. Even when we hang withered on our stem, we hang upon him. We cannot go from his Spirit, we cannot flee from his presence. If you prefer to say that God created or made man, you will allow that such terms cannot be used in any gross or mechanical sense. Surely no thoughtful person can imagine that man is fabricated or manufactured, like an edifice, or web of human handicraft, by an outward and merely mechanical process; for though the body is of matter, matter itself has sprung from God, and the soul is the special and direct communication, outbreath, or as we say, inspiration of the Infinite soul. Man is "made in the image of God;" and "the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." In his higher nature, man is not mechanical, but vital; not material, but spiritual; not phenomenal and transient, but essential and permanent. He lives—lives in God—lives forever. God, as a spirit, is a voluntary cause. Man, too, is a voluntary cause. God lives not by bread, but by thought, by volition, by affection and eternal blessedness. Man lives not by bread alone, but by thought, by love, by purity and everlasting joy.

Here, then, is the central unity of God, of nature, of science, and of man. In which great truth is involved the question of the actual or historical unity of the race. As linked

with the idea of God, and of the universe, this is the question of questions. It implies all others, embraces all others. It involves the character, the duty, and the destiny of us all.

We have affirmed it dogmatically. We have also affirmed it, as we affirm the actual physiological or natural descent of all men, from a single primitive pair, on the express authority of the Sacred Scripture. It is clear enough from this source, that we all bear the image of the first Adam, and that all descend from him by natural generation. As he was, so are we, in all essential things. If by nature he belonged to God, so do we. If by sin he fell from God, so have we fallen. If he died, so must we. If he was saved by a return to God, so shall we by a similar return. We came from the Father of Spirits, and thither must go back, in order to be happy forever.

But this subject may be discussed inductively, and the unity of the race, in its higher and more spiritual relations, proved from fact and observation, to which task we give the remaining part of this disquisition. It is one of profound interest, and great practical value.

We maintain, then, that all men, in higher or lower degree, bear unequivocal marks of a common nature and a common origin. As a matter of fact, it is ascertained, that "as in water face answers to face, so the heart of man to man." Thought answers to thought, conscience to conscience, feeling to feeling, the world over. A strange bond unites us all. Willing or unwilling, we respond to the race.

1. We discover the fact first in the universal possession of *Reason*: under which we include self-consciousness, the knowledge of our own mental acts, the power of introspection, of reflection, and combination, and especially the high capacity to form and receive universal truths. We suppose that the inferior animals, many of them at least, are capable, within slight limits, of a certain process of deduction. Dogs and elephants know their home, their master, their friends, and often take sagacious means to accomplish their ends; but we have no evidence that they possess the capacity to reflect upon their mental acts, or to form any conception of an abstract or general truth. This highest attribute of reason belongs only to man, angels, and God; and it is in this respect, especially, that men are to be considered as formed in the image of God. Now the rudest savage possesses the power of self-reflection; he can contemplate his own mental states; and so make himself double, that is, subject and object; he is conscious often, even in his deepest ignorance, of a strange feeling of wonder, as he listens to the beatings of his heart, looks up into the silent

heavens, or sees the vast horizon of being, by which he is encircled, extending further and further, as he advances into the illimitable depths. The rude Calmuc, or the besotted Hottentot, feels that he is separated from the inferior animals by an impassable limit. He is capable of introspection and combination, of adding thought to thought, of recognizing his own spiritual nature, and forming the conception of abstract and general truths. Cause, power, spirit, God, right, space, time, eternity,—all can be conveyed to his mind. He thinks, he reasons, emerges from his superstitions, and exults in the belief of God, of the soul, of immortality. "Teacher," said some rude Peguans, worshipers of the mortal Budh, "what you say respecting the eternal God, must be true." "Ah, this is what I want," cried a thoughtful Hindoo, throwing away his instruments of self-inflicted torture, "and O, how superior to the teaching of the Shastres!" Among all nations, travelers and missionaries tell us, are found thoughtful persons, some of them of subtle intellect and far-reaching views, who, while they sometimes dispute the doctrines of the Bible, often end by admitting its elementary truths, those especially touching God and eternity; and even when they cannot reach this high theme, their minds float around it with a painful fascination.

A Hindoo lay upon his death-bed: As he saw himself about to plunge into the dread abyss, he cried out, "What will become of me?" "O," said a Brahmin, "you will inhabit another body." "And where," said he, "shall I go then?" "Into another," was the reply. "And where," said he, "shall I go then?" "Into another, and another, and thus on through millions of years." Darting along this immense period as if it were only an instant, he cried: "And where shall I go then?" There was no reply, and the quivering spirit passed into eternity. The Pantheism of India, monstrous as it is, after all, is a shadow of the sublime reality. There is something so conatural to the human mind in the idea of infinite cause, of boundless wisdom and eternal power, that nearly all reflective minds, even among the heathen, are instantly impressed with its awful grandeur and beauty. "Teacher," said a Burman, "You speak of the eternal God, who made the world; but who made God?" "God," was the reply, "is not made,—God is. God is cause, eternal cause, goodness and power. God is from eternity to eternity; all things are made by him, and hang upon him." The heathen was struck with the reply. He seemed astonished, was silent for a few minutes, and then replied, "Teacher, this is wonderful." After another pause, "Teacher, it must be so."

When a Western missionary endeavored, in a somewhat

elaborate discourse, to prove to the wild Indians that there is a God who made the world, and all things therein, he was stopped short by one of their number, who said, "Don't preach to us about that: the winds, the waves, the storms, preach that to us better than you can. The forest, bending beneath the tempest, and the red lightning rending the rocks, declare to us the presence and power of the Eternal Spirit." Yes, the mind, in its natural and unperverted play, recognizes the truth of a supreme and eternal cause, and instinctively feels not only that there is a God, but a soul, and a soul-world. Certain French philosophers, on board ship with Napoleon on a starry night in the Mediterranean, were disputing the existence of an Almighty Ruler; Napoleon, who was pacing the deck near them, suddenly stopped, and pointing to the blazing vault above, said, in his quick, impressive way, "Gentlemen, you may talk as you please, but who made all that?"

What is this reason in man which recognizes the absolute, the unlimited, the everlasting? What is this wonderful power which makes him, in some sense, one with God, with the universe, and eternity;—which supplies even the rudest savage with the great primal truth of the universe, the essential and prolific germ of all other truths? The "inspiration of the Almighty," some would say, with a reverent awe, referring to the source whence it springs. "The *Oversoul*, the mystic and eternal oversoul, which links you, and me, and all men, and forms the thought of our thought, the feeling of our feeling, the life of our life," cries another, with a strange and dreamy Teutonic eloquence. *Lucerna Dei*, the Lamp of God, we respond, deriving our thought from the immortal Bacon, whose clear and reverent wisdom commends itself to all. *The Lamp of God kindled at the central sun, and fed forever by an Almighty hand.*

It seems to us that, by the possession of reason, and the capacity to know God, man, however ignorant in other respects, possesses the power of knowing all other things. He stands, so to speak, at the centre of being; so that if his vision were only pure enough and strong enough, he might glance through all the radii of existence, sweeping, in lines of light, into the infinite spaces. All things, according to Malebranche, one of the most devout and eloquent of the early French philosophers, are seen in God. As a metaphysical dogma, expressed in strictly logical forms, this may not be precisely true; but as a great and thrilling fact, in figurative and popular phrase, and with some slight modification of import, it harmonizes with Divine Revelation. Hence, the old divines, catching the idea from this source, were wont to pray, that we might "see light

in the light of God." And if "our life is hid with Christ in God," our knowledge must be there too. True, we now see through a glass darkly; but the time is to come when we shall see "face to face," when we shall "know even as we are known." That is, we shall see truth at its centre, by a direct intuition, as God sees it; and so, in our sphere and measure, "know God," even as "we are known of God."

There is a wide apparent difference between a savage, like Africaner, and a philosopher, like Sir Isaac Newton; but the distance, after all, is not so vast as is generally supposed. Africaner knew God, and used often, as Moffat tells us, to stand gazing, in devout wonder, at the starry heavens. He knew nothing of gravitation—of parallaxes and occultations; but he knew God, and saw that eye of love looking down upon him from every star, as it burned in beauty and glory in the depths of night. Thus the distance between two such minds is not one of kind, but of degree; and the savage has only to be educated long enough and thoroughly enough, in order to reach the point at which the philosopher arrived, when in this world. The savage may never make this attainment in his present circumstances; but who can doubt that, in the world to come, he may not only reach it, but far, very far transcend it, if redeemed by the love of God, and brought to dwell with angels, amid the light of heaven? He has in him the capacity—the slumbering and undeveloped germ of all possible knowledge; and, starting towards the central sun, may keep advancing nearer, and nearer, and nearer, through eternal ages. At any rate, if scientific knowledge will not result from conversion to God, something higher and better will. "For this is life eternal to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

O! it is this consideration which gives such worth, such inestimable worth and dignity to every man, whether he be a Milton, whose majestic thoughts wander through eternity, or a Krishnu Pal, sitting under the shadow of the banyan tree, and singing, in his native Hindoo, the song written by himself:

"O! thou, my soul, forget no more
The friend, who all thy sorrows bore;
Let every idol be forgot,
But, O! my soul, forget him not."

The world, indeed, seems to contain a vast amount of rubbish; but there lie embedded in it numberless priceless gems. India, Africa, Burmah, China, Ceylon, are full of just such gems; obscured, indeed, by ignorance and lust, but only needing to be drawn from their obscurity, to be polished, and

set in the crown of the Redeemer, to shine with a lustre more resplendent than the stars. They are of more worth by far than all the suns which ever shone, and all the worlds, which revolve in beauty around their central orbs.

2. Another high distinction of man, which proves his unity, and links him to God, is *conscience*. This universal attribute or power lurks in the deep tissues of our moral constitution, and can never be eradicated. Every man, whatever his character or country, must recognize the fact of accountability. Perverted or unperverted, he instinctively feels, contrary sometimes to his speculative theories, that there is an immutable distinction between the good and the bad, the just and the unjust; and such a feeling he betrays whenever he says, that such a thing is right, or such a thing is wrong. He has the thought, the intuition, the impulse, in his own bosom, which compels him to acknowledge his responsibility to law; and if to law, to a Supreme law-giver. Conscience, indeed, may be mutilated and suppressed—nay, killed and buried in the ruins of the soul, but it will rise again and assert its dominion. There are men without eyes and limbs—there are men diseased and ruined, body and soul; and so there may be men who seem without a conscience, or whose conscience is locked up by the triple bolts of infidelity, selfishness, and lust, in the prison of the heart's ungodliness; but conscience is an attribute of man, as much as thought and feeling are attributes of the mind, or the eyes and limbs parts of the body. He feels, therefore, as by a resistless impulse from God, that he belongs to a system of moral government, and that there awaits him, both here and hereafter, a joyful or a dread reward. This sense of right and wrong, this feeling of accountability to justice, this premonition of reward or punishment—now brooding over men, like an angel, with dove-like wings, now like a demon, or Nemesis, with wings of death—exists in all times, and among all nations. The intellect often errs as to what is right and wrong,—now imagining it a holy thing to murder a heretic, or cast a little child into the sacred Ganges, a mother's most precious gift to the river-god, whom she dreads and would pacify; but conscience never loses sight of the abstract and immutable distinction itself. Over all broods the everlasting thought of a rewarding or avenging power. "Cast your eyes," says Rousseau, "over all the nations of the world, and all the histories of nations. Amid so many inhuman and absurd superstitions, amid that prodigious diversity of manners and characters, you will find everywhere the same principles and distinctions of moral good and evil. The paganism of the ancient world produced, indeed, abominable gods, who on earth would have

been shunned or punished as monsters, and who offered, as a picture of supreme happiness, only crimes to commit or passions to satiate. But vice, armed with this sacred authority, descended in vain from the eternal abode. She found in the heart of man a moral instinct to repel her. The continence of Zenocrates was admired by those who celebrated the debaucheries of Jupiter. The chaste Lucretia adorned the unchaste Venus. The most intrepid Roman sacrificed to fear. He invoked the god who dethroned his father, and died, without a murmur, by the hand of his own."

Our very guilt, so deep, so universal, though hidden and palliated by all, is a proof of our unity. "I also am a man," we may sometimes exclaim, with pride and exultation; but we must as often say it with profound humility and regret. All over the world, blood flows from ten thousand heathen altars. And for what, if not for sin? So intense, indeed, is the sense of guilt, that the burden, in some cases, is relieved only by death. If, in his pharisaic pride, some one should separate himself from his fellows, and, practically denying the unity of the race, should claim that he is free from sin, the race, true to its moral instincts, will repudiate that man as a hypocrite, and unite to drag him from his supremacy. You cannot persuade them that a perfect man exists. A sinless child, or a sinless angel, they can admit; but a sinless man they cannot even imagine. Infidels and atheists themselves, except when theorizing or debating, acknowledge this great fact, and occasionally feel its influence with tremendous force. Unconsciously they admit their moral nature and their consequent guilt, and, in certain great exigencies and extremities, tremble with unspeakable horror in the prospect of final retribution. It is on this ground we explain the horrors which invaded the death-beds of Voltaire and Francis Newport. Their very nature, long abused, asserted its dominion, and inflicted the premonitory stings of eternal remorse.

"In such indexes——
 —————There is seen
 The baby figures of the giant mass
 Of things to come at large."

This is the great principle on which God "commandeth all men," high or low, bond or free, Pagan or Christian, everywhere to repent; and it is *this* which gives the truth of the gospel such immense power over the heart. Despised and rejected, times without number, it comes back again, and speaks to the conscience in thunder tones; so that it often

happens that, all at once, as by the hand of the Almighty, the hardened skeptic feels himself converted and subdued. "I heard it, but I heeded it not," said a man of a lofty and indomitable spirit. "I heard it again, but I hated it, as if it were death. And yet once more I heard it, and my spirit melted. It was as if God himself, with the resistless might of his infinite love, spoke to my inner spirit. I was transfixed. Wonder—fear—hope—shame—grief—love—joy—sprang up in my soul. I wept like a child; and kneeling down before my Saviour and God, with a trembling awe, I confessed my sins and sought His forgiveness." "*Remorse! remorse!*" exclaimed the dying Randolph of Roanoke, to his physician—"You know nothing about it: you cannot know. * * *

But I have looked upon the cross of Christ, and hope I have obtained mercy." "Ah me!" cried the departing chief of the South Sea isles, in reply to the inquiry of the missionary, touching his spiritual state—"as I lay here alone, all became dark before me. My sins rose up between me and heaven, mountains upon mountains—mountains upon mountains. But, all at once, one drop of the blood of Jesus Christ fell upon them, and in a few minutes the mountains vanished away!"

What an inconceivable importance does such a fact attach to the moral destiny of man! On his conduct here, hang everlasting things. Every motion of his—every thought, word, and act, touches a string which stretches into eternity, and vibrates forever.

3. A third, and most peculiar characteristic of man, in proof of his unity, is his *capacity for religion*.

All, we presume, admit the fact of adaptations. The internal nature of man is adapted to the external; the soul is adapted to the body, the body to the various objects which affect it. Our whole constitution and framework imply the existence of the external world. The eye is adapted to light, and implies its existence; the stomach is adapted to food, and implies its existence; the social feeling is adapted to society, and implies its existence; the moral sense, or conscience, is adapted to a standard of morality, a law and a law-giver, and implies their existence. Thus, one thing is set over against another, and makes the existence of that other absolutely necessary; because all these are parts of a great whole, into which they are fitted and adapted by an infinite hand. Hence the principle of analogy or similitude which runs through the universe, by which one thing not only suggests, but actually proves, the presence of the next, and that again of the next, and so on, through the circle of being. Thus, the sentiment of veneration, the feeling of worship, the love of the ideal, the

perfect, the illimitable, are adapted to the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, and make religion a necessary element of our being. Man is as much distinguished in this respect as in any other. He is as much a worshipping being, as he is a thinking and reasoning being. Doubtless, there are men without religion, as there are men without reason, and yet both reason and religion are peculiar to man. Neither of these may be visible in particular individuals, or even communities, any more than the cerulean color of the ocean is visible in drops, or insulated masses of water, though sufficiently obvious in the great whole. Man, too, may worship falsely, as he may reason falsely. His gods may be puerile, and his worship superstitious, but the instinct is universal and resistless. Society is always organized around some divine idea. No other element can hold it together. Agitated by change and revolution, it uniformly settles back, and, so to speak, gravitates to this mighty centre. Hence, in every community there may be a few infidels and atheists, persons who, as exceptions to the general rule, have violated their nature, and extinguished within them the sentiment of worship; but a nation of such men does not exist, cannot exist. For the same reason, infidelity may spread like a wave of death over a community, but it will soon retire, and the feeling of worship spring up again from the germs which were hidden beneath the surface, and apparently lost in the tide of unbelief.

Man was made for God, for perfection, illimitable and immortal. Therefore, he never finds his true position nor his true felicity, till restored to God, he revolves, like a star, around the centre of his spiritual nature. And society itself will never be truly organized till, pervaded by a divine affection, it recognizes the full supremacy of God, the true and sacred brotherhood of man. Thence is Christianity a system of reconciliation and reunion. This is its vital, all-pervading idea—this its single and sublime purpose, “God is in Christ reconciling, reuniting the world unto himself.” He feels after them, that he may find them; speaks to them in the language of remonstrance, warning, and pity; nay, more, comes to them, in Christ, that by a miracle of mercy, transcendent and wonderful, he may subdue their enmity, and take them to his bosom. It is evident, that man has fallen from his original state, that by the abuse of his free agency he has wandered from God, and so darkened and obscured his noble nature. After all, that nature, dark and ruined as it is, has something in it celestial and immortal, like the beautiful ruins of an ancient, and not altogether extinct fountain in the heart of some deserted city. It belongs to God, and yet bears the traces of its

august origin. Weak, wayward, and perishing, the soul, akin to God and angels, can respond to the touch of Omnipotent love, and, so passing from death to life, become a new creature in Christ Jesus. No matter how ignorant and besotted, how utterly godless and vile, that celestial thing may hear the voice of the Son of God emerge from the grave, and find its home in the bosom of God forever. Is proof of this required from actual facts? Go, then, to the valley of the Mohawk, in the yet unbroken silence of the primeval forest. Do you see that fierce Oneida chief, the far-famed, but bloody and relentless Shenandoah, whose tomahawk has been plunged a thousand times in the heads of his enemies, and whose very name sends a thrill of horror into the hearts of helpless women and children! Fierce as a whirlwind, he dashes upon the fearful settlement, and horror, burning, and desolation, are the result. For sixty years has his pathway been marked with blood, and his terrible warwhoop rung through the valley. Can such an one become a child of God, a meek and humble follower of Jesus Christ? Yes; under the preaching of the gospel, the tomahawk falls from his grasp, and his long life becomes one continued act of adoration and praise. He died at the age of a hundred years. A little while before his death, a friend, calling to see him, and inquiring after his health, received this answer: "I am an aged hemlock; the winds of a hundred winters have whistled through my branches. I am dead at the top, (referring to his blindness.) Why I yet live, the great, good Spirit only knows. When I am dead, bury me by the side of my minister and friend, (Rev. Mr. Kirkland, under whose ministry he had been awakened and converted,) that I may go up with him at the great resurrection."

If this is not sufficient, cross the wide Atlantic to the fervid plains of Southern Africa, where roam predatory tribes of far different lineage and language, and of yet wilder superstitions, and more savage customs. Among these is a chief, the very Ishmael of the land, who lives in continual strife with those around him; whose hand is against every man; whose business is rapine, and whose passion revenge; whose name is a terror not only to the colonists of the South, but to the nations of the North; in a word, the very lion of the forest, as the natives call him, whose fierce war cry, as he rushes to battle, carries dismay into the hearts of all. But there he stands, the Bible in his hand, side by side with the Missionary Moffat, beseeching hostile tribes to love each other. "Look," said a Namaqua chief on such an occasion, pointing to Africaner, "there is the man once the lion, at whose roar even the inhabitants of distant hamlets fled from their homes. Yes, and I,"

patting his chest with his hand, "have, for fear of his approach, fled with my people, our wives and our babes, to the mountain glen, or to the wilderness, and spent nights among beasts of prey, rather than gaze on the eyes of the lion, or hear his roar." The change in the case of Africaner was immense and striking. "Often have I seen him," says Moffat, "under the shadow of a great rock, nearly the livelong day, eagerly perusing the pages of Divine Inspiration, or in his hut he would sit, unconscious of the affairs of his family around, or the entrance of a stranger, with his eye gazing on the blessed book, and his mind wrapt up in things divine. Many were the nights he sat with me, on a great stone at the door of my habitation, conversing with me till the dawn of another day, on creation, providence, redemption, and the glories of the heavenly world. Nor did he confine his expanding mind to the volume of revelation, though he had been taught by experience that that contained heights and depths, and lengths and breadths, which no man comprehends. He was led to look upon the book of nature; and he would regard the heavenly orbs with an inquiring look, cast his eye on the earth beneath his tread, and regarding both as displays of creative power and infinite intelligence, would inquire about boundless space and endless duration."

"One day," adds Mr. Moffat, "when seated together, I happened, in absence of mind, to be gazing at him. It arrested his attention, and he modestly inquired the cause. I replied, 'I was trying to picture to myself your carrying fire and sword through the country, and I could not think how eyes like yours could smile at human woe.' He answered not, but shed a flood of tears."

Africaner, in company with his friend and teacher, visited Capetown, and stopped on his way at the house of a Dutch farmer, and being disguised by his dress, for fear of unpleasant consequences, was not recognized. The missionary gave the farmer some account of the conversion of Africaner, but he would not believe such an impossibility. "He is now a truly good man," said Moffat. To which he replied, "I can believe almost anything you say, but that I cannot credit. There are seven wonders in the world, and that would be the eighth." Moffat referred to other displays of divine grace, in a Saul of Tarsus, and others. "That may be," said the farmer, "but they were another description of men, and that Africaner is one of the accursed sons of Ham," enumerating some of the atrocities of which he had been guilty. Africaner looked on with a pleasant smile. Finally, said the farmer, with great earnestness, "If what you say respecting that man be true, I have only one

wish, and that is, to see him before I die; and when you return, as sure as the sun is over our heads, I will go with you to see him, though he killed my own uncle." Not being aware of this fact before, Moffat hesitated whether he should discover him; but knowing the sincerity of the farmer and the goodness of his disposition, he said, "This, then, is Africaner!" He started back, looked intensely at the man, as if he had just dropped from the clouds. "Are you Africaner?" he exclaimed. He arose, doffed his old hat, and making a polite bow, answered, "I am!" The farmer was thunderstruck, but satisfying himself of the fact by a few questions, that the lion was indeed turned into a lamb, he lifted up his eyes and exclaimed, "O God, what a miracle of thy power! What cannot thy grace accomplish!"

Illustrations of this sort might be multiplied to an indefinite extent. They might be taken from all ranks and conditions of men, and from every nation under heaven; from the most enlightened and civilized to the most degraded and barbarous. The young, the old, the rich, the poor, the bond, the free, the black, the white, the red, the yellow, and the copper-colored, the gentle and the savage, the wild hunter of the forest and the peaceful dweller in cities, the fierce Numidian warrior, with the soft and dreamy Hindoo,—all have received the gospel, and under its influence have lived holy lives, and died peaceful deaths. Christianity has vindicated the essential unity of the race, and will yet bring all nations into fraternal concord.

4. *A fourth distinction of man*, and the last we shall adduce in favor of our position, is *his capacity for improvement*. This, indeed, is involved in the preceding arguments, but it deserves a particular illustration here, not simply with reference to mental, but to moral progress. It is the sum and completion of all the other arguments, and bears directly not only on the question of our origin, but of our final destiny. From his cradle to his grave, and through all possible vicissitudes, and even calamities, man may advance in mental vigor and moral worth. Evermore his mind may become calmer, deeper, clearer, and stronger; like some fair river, deepening and expanding in its passage to the deep sea. What a difference in this respect between a child and a man; though the child, as the poet Wordsworth finely expresses it, is "father to the man," for the same reason that the little fountain among the hills is parent to the vast and beautiful stream which bears on its bosom the commerce of the land. So, also, society may improve in knowledge, science, and virtue; though final and universal progress among the nations can only be secured by a recognition of the great principle of a divine unity in Jesus

Christ. What a contrast, however, even now, between our rude Saxon forefathers, whose days were occupied in war, hunting, and drinking, and the cultivated inhabitants of England and the United States! What a change in the select and holy society of truly regenerate men, once without God and without hope in the world! What an advance in those who receive the gospel in its simplicity, from the sensual heathen, bowing to idols, or wallowing in vice! If the progress of society, as a whole, is not such as might be desired, the capacity is there, the love, the longing, the inextinguishable hope—all are there.

But it is in individuals, especially, that we see this high power. All possess it; in some only is it fairly developed. How beautifully was it brought out in such men as Paul and Luther, Fenelon and Washington, Milton and Howard. But what are these men now? As far beyond their former selves, doubtless, as they were once beyond common men, or themselves, in the days of their childhood. In fact, the capacity of improvement in man appears illimitable. The more he does, the more he can do. The greater his knowledge, the more capacious his power for its investigation and reception. The moral powers, especially, strengthen by use and time. They seem to demand a boundless range, an everlasting duration. They overleap all barriers, conquer all difficulties. Our deepest sorrows only work for us "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." In this respect there is a sort of infinity in the human mind. On the other hand, all the inferior animals are limited in this respect. They make no progress; their tendency is simply to propagate their kind, or absolutely to die out, like the extinct races of ancient geological eras. But man is never stationary. He lives in the future. He works, even when ignorant of it, for something ideal, something vast and ineffable. The good man, especially, spurns the temporal, and grasps the eternal. He conquers death and the grave. Dissolution itself serves only to develop and consummate his powers. It is the body which perishes, the soul escapes into eternity. Thus at least we reason, by an ineffable instinct and longing for immortality; and on the ground of a certain obvious adaptation in the purified and advancing spirit to that higher and grander sphere. Is it not on this ground that the dying often rise superior to themselves, and display a grandeur of conception, a beauty and depth of emotion, far transcending anything ever experienced in life? It would seem as if the clouds which brood over all, and hide the radiance of the purified spirit, break at sunset, and leave the soul to depart in a flood of glory. "Many things," said the dying Schiller,

"are becoming clearer to me." "Calmer and calmer," were his last happy words. "I am all light," said Olympia Morata, when sinking in the arms of death. "Good night!" said a dying mother to her children—"good night!"—and then added, while a radiant smile played upon her countenance—"The day breaks!" The death of Halyburton was like the coronation of a king amid music and sunshine. His spirit seemed to career, as on wings of light, amid the rising splendors of the eternal world. To his wife he said—"My sweet bird, are you there? Deeply have I loved thee; but I am no more thine, but the Lord's. Do not weep; you should rather rejoice. We shall meet again, and be in the same family in heaven." "James," he said, to his aged elder, "ye are an old man, and I am dying; yet the child is going to die an hundred years old. I am like a shock of corn fully ripe. I have ripened fast under the bright sun of righteousness, and I have had brave showers." At eventide a peaceful light illumined his countenance; for at "eventide it was light" in the soul. In the early morning he passed away. Just before he died, he said—"I am thinking on the pleasant spot of earth that I will get to lie in, beside Mr. Rutherford and Principal Anderson. I will come in as the little one among them, and I will get my little George in my hand, and oh, *we will be a group of bonnie dust!*" At last his voice failed, but with a countenance all eloquent of love and joy he passed into eternity. "Mother, do you hear them?" said a youthful Christian, lying worn and weary on the brink of eternity. "Hear what, my child?" "Why, the angels—the blessed angels—

Hark, they say,
Sister spirit, come away!"

"O!" cried Payson, in his last hour, "I have looked upon God, hitherto, as a fixed star, very bright and beautiful, but at a distance; but now he seems to me a sun, coming nearer and nearer to me. As I lie here, I seem to be swimming in a sea of glory."

Thus, nature suggests, and Christianity corroborates, the doctrine of the soul's immortality—its capacity for infinite and eternal improvement. It makes known the untold worth of every human being, and assures us of a future state, more perfect than the present, in which the largest hopes, the most boundless desires, shall be gratified forever.

True, indeed, the soul's capacity for improvement implies also its capacity for deterioration. This, indeed, is involved in the fact of its personality and free agency. Its salvation, or

everlasting life, involves the possibility of its perdition, or everlasting death. Hence the terrible eloquence of our Saviour's words: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

"———Worlds possessed can't purchase
Worlds destroyed, not injure; which holds on
Its glorious course, when thine, O nature! fails."

Immortal!—immortal for weal, or for woe—all immortal!
What affecting, what transcendent interest does this attach to
the destiny of every man,—to the destiny of the meanest slave!

"Immortal! ages past, yet nothing gone.
Morn without eve!—a race without a goal!
Unshortened by progression infinite!
Futurity for ever future! life
Beginning still where computation ends.
'Tis the description of a Deity!
'Tis the description of the meanest slave!"

Why, then, should not such a destiny, in every case, become an infinite blessing? If the race has sprung from God, and is thence one in all the higher attributes and possibilities of its nature, the conversion and salvation of one sinner is a proof of the *possible* conversion and salvation of all. The actual redemption of multitudes already, and the rapid progress of Christianity in many lands, is a demonstration and pledge that all may yet hear the voice of God; and on earth, as in heaven, sing the song of Moses and the Lamb.

Shall man, then, born of God, and though fallen, to be "born again" by the Holy Spirit; shall man, for whom all nature moves, and the very stars rise and set; for whom the Son of God died on the cross, and the great heart of infinite love yet longs and struggles—shall man perish in his sins? Shall the nations, given to Christ for his inheritance, go down to eternal night? Forbid it, ye angels of light, ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation! Forbid it, O Church of the living God, with the gospel in thy hands, to give it to the world! Forbid it, ye consecrated men, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and chosen to be heralds of the great salvation! Forbid it, O Son of the Highest, who didst give thy life a ransom for many! And thou, Spirit of the living God, forbid it! O penetrate the masses sitting in the shadow of death; and by the might of thine infinite love, quicken all to a divine and imperishable life!

ART. V.—THE PERMANENCE OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

BY ABRAHAM PAYNE, ESQ.,

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

The Progress of America, from the Discovery of Columbus to the year 1846. By JOHN MACGREGOR, Q. C. London: Whitaker & Co. 1847.

WE do not intend to criticise this book, or to give any account of its contents, but to offer some remarks upon some of the causes of our national prosperity, a topic naturally suggested by a work like this. The subject can borrow no charm of novelty; because, if the discussion have any merit, it must be derived from an accurate statement of facts, whose existence is obvious, and whose importance is undisputed. To speculate, however, upon the destiny of the Republic, has always been a favorite occupation of the American citizen. If we succeed—such has been the feeling—we shall become the greatest nation upon the face of the earth; if we fail, the experiment of self-government by the people will never be renewed. Under the influence of this feeling, the nation—if the expression may be pardoned—has been constantly inquiring after the state of its own health, and the natural consequence has been, the discovery of a great many dangerous, and some fatal, symptoms. It would be curious to cite authorities, to show how often, and from what causes, the state has been in danger; more curious, perhaps, than useful. Our present purpose is to consider some of those causes lying behind, and independent of, any direct political action, which give reasonable assurance of national permanence and prosperity.

The tendency of modern research has been, to cause men to look elsewhere than in the direct action of governments for the principal causes which affect the welfare of nations. The influences of climate, of geography, of race, of social usages, and of religion, have been rising in importance; while the influences of legislation, of cabinets, and of armies, have been receding. This tendency has been carried, in many instances, to a ridiculous excess, but it has a foundation in fact, and the true balance of causes will be found at last.

A distinguished senator of the United States, in a recent speech, pointed out the manner in which the great highways of this country have been formed. The wild beasts, in their annual migrations, guided by an unerring instinct, find the shortest and easiest path. The Indian makes his war-path in

the track of the wild beast. The pioneer follows the war-path of the Indian; and finally comes the engineer, the learned and accomplished agent of civilized society, to build the railway and the telegraph along the line indicated by the pioneer, and which the pioneer had learned of the Indian, and which the Indian had learned of the wild beast.

This may illustrate imperfectly the manner of a nation's growth. The extent, position, and configuration of its territory, will determine to some extent its character. The type and general history of the race taking possession of this territory, will add another element. Out of these two, acting upon a common nature, everywhere fearfully and wonderfully made, will spring some form of religion, side by side with which, and greatly under its influence, will grow up forms of social and political action, and all these will be to a great extent predestined and fore-ordained. Under them, and limited by them, the citizen finds room for voluntary action, individual and associated, reacts upon the society whose creature he is, apparently turns backward the currents of influence, and becomes the creator of all the wonders of civilized life.

Whoever will study with care the history of any nation, will soon learn that it is as true of society as of the individual, that it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps—that all the stages of national development and decay, from the rude energy of early colonization to the indolent luxury which indicates rather than causes a downward tendency, and on to the abject wretchedness which crawls amidst the monuments of former splendor, are the result of laws which include, and take account of, the voluntary agency of man, but which are, in an important sense, beyond his control. "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes," is the first thought of the man who ponders, with serious attention, the lessons of history.

This is as well illustrated in the history of our own, as of any other country. It would be difficult to point out in history a body of men superior to that body who assembled in convention to form the constitution of the United States. They were men of mature years. They had, many of them, made the science of government a subject of profound and continuous study—some of them have never been surpassed in general intellectual ability, and in the peculiar qualities of statesmen. They were eminently patriotic. They felt very sensibly the responsibility which was laid upon them. They had the benefit of frank and thorough discussion and consultation with each other; and, as was to have been expected, the result of their labors was a great triumph, and has proved itself in a

trial, always arduous, and not now short, admirably adapted to the purpose which they had in view. And yet how soon, under the government, was seen the operation of causes which they did not foresee; and of the things which they did foresee, of how many did they fail correctly to estimate the relative importance! That, which to many of them seemed an appalling danger, is now one of the main defences of our power; that, which to all of them seemed a local, limited, and receding evil, is now perplexing, with fear of change, our wisest men. The practical construction of the constitution is, at this moment, and in important particulars, at variance with the intention of all its founders. The practical administration of the government is not what either Jefferson or Hamilton supposed it would be; and the great excellence of the system is, that, while it indicates its character in general outline, it has still shown itself pliant to the emergencies of a community, so rapidly changing, advancing, and developing as our own. In the matter of territory, for instance, leaving a way open for Louisiana first, and, in due time, for Texas, New Mexico, and California, and creating the general, and, upon the whole, healthy feeling, that, whatever else may happen to this nation, it will not at present perish for lack of room. And this brings us to the first great element of our strength. Whether a republican government was practicable over a great extent of territory, was a question which our fathers discussed with a good deal of ability; and one of the papers of the *Federalist* contains a well-considered argument, to show that the objection to the proposed constitution, drawn from the largeness of our domain, ought not to weigh much; and the author rises into a fervid eloquence, as he discourses upon the inheritance of the sons of liberty in this western world. And this argument applied to a territory bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the west by the Mississippi River, on the south by the thirty-first degree of latitude, and on the north by an irregular line, running in some places above the forty-fifth, and in others below the forty-second degree of latitude. He was thought a bold reasoner who contended that a republican government might embrace all that, and so he was. The file afforded no precedent; there was no parallel case; and strong and cogent arguments could be urged, and were urged, upon the other side. When Louisiana was purchased, it was thought by many a perilous undertaking; and so of Texas; and so of the recent acquisition of the golden regions of the setting sun; and so it was perilous. No man could define the result.

But how stands the question to-day? We feel a sensation of confidence when we look upon the map. With the Atlantic

Ocean upon one side, and the Pacific Ocean upon the other, with liberty of going north and south whenever circumstances may require, we feel that we have ample room and verge enough, and we feel that it is well that it is so; and if any man wishes for an excuse for viewing this matter differently from what he has done at some former period of his life, he may take shelter under the authority of Mr. Webster, who admits that upon this subject he has changed his mind. But no man's vanity will be hurt by an imputation of change upon a question like this, depending for its solution wholly upon experience. The course of events may well have wrought changes in the most stable and illuminated mind: and those of us who were full of auguries of evil, as we saw our empire stretching itself out over regions boundless and unexplored, may join with those of a more sanguine temperament in the general rejoicing, that we have taken possession of the most magnificent domain ever yet subjected to the rule of a single people.

But is the present opinion well founded, and is this domain a blessing? It is not a question to be settled with mathematical certainty. It is one of the questions depending upon feelings wiser oftentimes than any reasoning, or to speak more accurately, which are the result of the highest kind of reasoning. Every man likes to know that he is the citizen of a great country. The thought that the sun never sets upon the dominions of his queen, stirs the blood of an Englishman in whatever part of the earth his lot has been cast, and however humble his origin and present condition. The poorest man in Rome walked the streets of the Eternal City with a prouder step, whenever the intelligence passed along from man to man, that a new race of barbarians had submitted themselves to the eagles of the republic, and that a new region of the earth was part of the Roman Empire. And who of us has read without a glow of patriotic pride, the recent language of our Secretary of State, addressed to one of the oldest and haughtiest nations of the world—"The power of this Republic at the present moment is spread over a region, one of the richest and most fertile upon the face of the globe, and of an extent, compared with which the dominions of the House of Hapsburgh are but a patch upon the earth's surface."

Then, again, when we consider the division of this territory into states, its power as an element of tranquillity is seen at once. Every people need some check upon their impulses and passions. When there is no such check except in the government, there is danger of collision, of bad blood, and finally, of rebellion and revolution. Our system of government guards against this pretty well; but when this system is

expanded over so vast a territory, the danger seems to be entirely removed. All our excitements are local, and lose themselves in attempting to cross sectional and state lines. If the people of one section are in a passion, the chances are that all the other sections will be unusually quiet. If Massachusetts is hot with the fierce discussion of some little question, Rhode Island will probably be uncommonly dull, and looking for Boston papers, by way of relief from ennui. And this is the more obvious, when we consider the benignant expression with which the Union regards the occasional petulance of any of her children. She allows them to have their own way. They can hold as many conventions as they please, pass resolutions of defiance, appropriate their money for muskets or school-books, as they may think best. She will not interfere, for she knows that if any froward child needs, for the peace of the family, to be made a little more quiet, the means of domestic discipline are at her command.

Once more, this extent of territory leaves room for indefinite expansion and growth. The evil of over-population is too remote to be taken into account in any political calculation. The questions which are trying the stoutest hearts and ablest heads in England, will not arise here—if they arise at all—until some distant generation. Our material resources are abundant. Millions upon millions of acres of virgin soil are calling for the labors of the husbandman. Mineral resources, which no imagination can exhaust, are here ready to minister to the wants of commerce and the arts of industry. Around all is thrown the protection of the ocean—over all is spread the mingled features of beauty and grandeur—from all a various climate woos every form of vegetable production for our use; and that man is little to be envied, who can contemplate all this without emotions of pride and joy, easily ascending into gratitude to the Giver of All, and finding fit expression in the inspired language—"He hath not dealt so with any nation."

But mere material resources, though an essential, are only one element of national greatness. A degraded people now deform some of the richest and fairest regions of the earth; and all that we have yet said of this, our land, might have been said of it with equal truth, when it was the dwelling-place of warring and wandering tribes of Indians.

We find in the energy and activity of our people, the next great element of strength, prosperity, and union. Of the existence of these qualities, no one will make any question. It has become so much the custom of late years to boast about the Anglo-Saxon race, and to use arguments eminently calculated to provoke the scorn of men, and the indignation of

Heaven, drawn from their supposed destiny as a conquering tribe, that the statement of the sober truth may seem a little tame, the fact being, that the people of this country are a mixture of many races, all of them good, and the mixture better than any one of them. The Puritan was an Anglo-Saxon with an infusion of Norman blood—his northern imagination inflamed by the oriental imagery of the Old Testament, his intellect submissive to a creed drawn from the New, and shaped by the logic of Geneva. The Cavaliers were Normans with some Saxon blood, full of haughty passions and the love of pomp, attached by sentiment and memory to the monarchy and the hallowed forms of old religion, but drunk with the new-born liberty, because they loved its license. The Huguenots were crusaders, divested of the steel-clad armor of the thirteenth century, and clothed in the full panoply of the ideas of the sixteenth. The Hollanders were men of quiet, sent among us apparently for the purpose of showing how much may be accomplished by sitting still—a perpetual reproach upon the fussy activities of some of their more volatile neighbors. And so the list might be extended. So it has been from the beginning, is now, and will be for a long time to come. All tribes and nations, and clans and races, have been coming in here. They mingle, and yet they keep distinct. A critical inspection will show the peculiarities of each: but seen from a proper distance, they blend into one homogeneous mass. It is idle, therefore, to speculate here about race. These qualities of energy and activity pervade them all. Little more than two hundred years ago, they began to make their appearance upon the Atlantic coast. A sterile soil yields to their indomitable will. They make a stormy ocean tributary to their wealth. They subdue the Indian and his forests with the same relentless and unremitting zeal, causing corn to grow along the war-path, and schools and colleges to spring up where the council fires had blazed and gone out. They break the bands which bound them to the countries from which they came, form a government upon a new plan, and leaving the politicians to manage that, set about fulfilling the command to subdue and people the earth, in a manner hitherto wholly unprecedented—building cities with a rapidity rivalling the oriental tales of enchantment, trading in every part of the habitable earth, and not often getting the worst of the bargain; acquiring possession by one means or another of all the territory they want; and, what is more, setting on foot and sustaining a stupendous system of popular education, supporting by voluntary contribution the institutions of religion, and sending by the same means the missionary and the printing-press to every region of the earth.

Whatever else may be said of this people, they are evidently going ahead.

When we consider this element of national character in connection with our national resources, we perceive how the two combine to strengthen the bands of our union. Will the pioneers of civilization pause, and be arrested in their course, to listen to the bickerings and jealousies of the older states? Will the hardy adventurers of California, Oregon, Iowa, and Wisconsin, stop to split hairs about the resolutions of '98, or lend their ears to the speculations on the condition of society, in which those are accustomed to indulge who have less to do than they? These millions of busy, energetic, and aspiring men, have very little patience with nonsense. As long as they have free leave to till the earth, and dig in her bosom for mineral wealth, and thus benefit themselves by ministering to the wants of others, they will occupy themselves in that work. Add to this, a consideration of the intelligence with which all this activity is directed. This is a vast subject, and we can only give some general hints of what we mean. We are yet an infant nation in all respects but one. What are the first two hundred years in the history of any other nation?—of Greece, of Rome, of England? We are yet growing, rather than fully grown. The oldest and most thickly-settled portions of our territory are still rude and sparsely settled, when compared with England and the other nations, commonly enumerated as the civilized nations of the earth. We now and then hear it said that we have few cathedrals and churches with windows of stained glass—that our galleries of art are few, and do not by any means make up in quality for the smallness of their numbers—that we have no opera, and a very poor drama, and only a moderate and indifferent supply of poetry, or literature of any kind—in short, that we are very deficient in the elegance and refinement which belongs to a finished and complete state of society; all which is very true, and very little to the purpose.

In all these respects we are a rude and uncultivated people. We are engaged in subduing the earth to our uses, in making money, and providing for those wants which able-bodied, energetic, and ambitious men have, and are determined to gratify. The kind of intelligence which is required to find means for these ends, we have in abundance. The discoveries in science, and the improvements in the useful arts, which have marked the last half century, are familiar to us all. These, and all of these, the people of this country seize and make their own at once.

Let us contemplate for a moment this condition of things.

The diffusion of knowledge, by means of the press—the rapid communication by means of steam and electricity, acting upon our restless and energetic tempers—give a character to this intelligent activity, which is awful on the one side, and ridiculous on the other. The spectacle of millions of civilized men, in the main devoted to material pursuits, and the gratification of the senses and the passions, and using to these ends all the vast power which modern science and art have put into their hands, is one of grandeur; and if we examine it in detail, there are many things which cannot fail to excite our admiration: that kind of admiration which we must yield to power and success. The ridiculous aspect of the matter lies in the airs which some of these successful merchants, manufacturers, mechanics, and professional men, sometimes put on. The relative estimate which the things of this world and another have assumed in their minds—the pity they have for poor and unsuccessful people, are very entertaining to a quiet observer.

But this remark must be qualified. This country is not now, never was, and never will be, wholly devoted to material and selfish interests. Has not Channing recently left us the impress and model of a Christian philanthropist—his clear and pure thoughts lifting and bracing the spirit like a mountain breeze? Is not Dr. Beecher still with us—preaching, at nearly the age of eighty years, with youthful vigor and apostolic fervor—holding up so clearly the things which are unseen and eternal, that almost his hearers can look within the veil—the seals of his ministry numbered by thousands, even now living and acting in the great central valley of the Union—his influence to endure and expand there for generations—an influence compared with which, that of the wealth of Astor is as a gust of wind to the force of gravitation. And there, in colonial times, is Jonathan Edwards, his spirit acting now in every pulpit and press devoted to the Puritan faith. We never turn over the pages of his works without a feeling of awe; and when we have heard some impertinent coxcomb in canonicals, or some upstart doctor of divinity, with an air of superiority, apply his dapper measuring rod to this intellectual giant, and flippantly point out his errors, we have wished that the “buried majesty” of New-England might rise from the grave, and preach to him some passages of his sermon upon the justice of God in the damnation of sinners; and we could wish, too, that he might thunder his discourse, upon the sovereignty of God, in the ears of those members of Congress who seem to think that they bear a commission to enact the highest laws in the universe. We passed a day, not long since, in Northampton, and the ground he once trod upon seemed different from the com-

mon earth; and the mountain that looks upon the scene of his labors, seemed not so real as his spiritual presence. Why will not some young minister of this day turn away from its controversies—"noisy enough to drown the roar of ocean, upon questions as unsubstantial as its foam"—and, after the study of years shall have enabled him to undertake the task, do what Macaulay has done for Bacon—and present to this generation, in modern and attractive garb, the life and labors—the very form and pressure of the mightiest intellect which the western world has yet given to the Church of God. His style, rude and unstudied, is yet the style of genius; and, in occasional felicity in the adaptation of expression to thought, is only equalled in our language by Shakspeare and Bunyan—his thought, a mine of unwrought gold, richer than all California—the history of his struggle with his people, one of the most instructive and painful chapters in the history of man—his faith awful, and yet tranquil—and burning with the central fires, out of which

“————— rolled
The burden of the Bible old.”

We look at the missionary enterprises of the country, when at all inclined to mourn the departure of the ages of chivalry and the crusades. We are not ignorant of the history of the Catholic Church, nor unmindful of her influence upon civilization in the early ages of Europe. But we believe there has been more of that type of spirituality, which St. Paul possessed and inculcated, in this country, between the time of the arrival of the Mayflower and this hour, than there was in the whole Christian world, from the days of Constantine to those of Luther. This is not the time to dwell upon this; but we think he was not a shallow student of our history, nor of a mind wholly incapable of discerning the causes of things in the things themselves, who said, that our fathers were brought hither by their high veneration for the Christian religion. And this sentiment has been extending and expanding among us. Neither the love of money, nor any form of spiritual foppery, will extinguish it. The vulgar fallacies of the old-fashioned infidelity of Bolingbroke and Tom Paine have already been tumbled into the lumber-rooms and garrets of the human mind. The ponderous logic and foggy dreams of rationalism will follow in due time; and so will any future form of error which may steam up from the rank soil of human vanity and pride, while the faith of the gospel, one in spirit, and diverse in form, shall have free course, and be glorified in this our land as never on the earth before—waiting

upon the birth, the bridal, and the death-bed, to the last syllable of recorded time. This we have felt called upon to say, to qualify what was said before, and concerning an element of our strength, whose full power it does not belong to us more fully to explain and enforce.

And the remark which was made needs one other qualification. The devotion to material pursuits which characterizes the leading men in this country—we mean the merchants, manufacturers, great agricultural producers, and master mechanics—is in itself a vast improvement upon the occupation and character of the leading classes of men in any other age or country of the world. Compare with them the proud and dominant patrician of Rome, the fierce and mailed baron or knight of the middle ages, or even the modern aristocracy of England, in their relation to the masses of men, and the great interests of society. The attempt to create an admiration for the middle ages, by comparing them favorably with our own, is made of late so seriously in England and in this country, and involves so many men of high reputation in church and state, that we feel some delicacy in speaking of it as it seems to us to deserve. But which is the most respectable, the master mechanic, who is putting up buildings for a fair compensation, and paying his laborers prices which enable them to feed and clothe themselves and their families in comfort and with abundance, or the baron bold, who stole the toil of his suffering tenantry, plundered his neighbors, and then atoned for his sins by consecrating his dishonest gains to the erection of a beautiful temple to his God. This illustrates one important difference between our degenerate days and that blessed era in the history of man—between the ages of mammon and the ages of faith.

Another element of vast power, rendering secure and stable all those which have been previously mentioned, and opening the way for whatever may be of value in the future attainments of this people, is the definite, practical, and inherited opinions which we have upon the subject of civil and religious liberty. Upon this part of our subject we must dwell a little. The subject of liberty has been a fruitful theme of the orator and the poet, of the pulpit and of the press; and yet a great deal which has been said and written upon it—well written and spoken too—seems to us in this country very little to the purpose. Men have written and spoken as if liberty were an end, and not merely a valuable and indispensable means to an end. Why do we demand freedom? Because it will remove obstacles to the accomplishment of whatever purpose we have in view. The saint desires it, because it will leave him unmolest-

ed to worship God; the robber desires it, because it will clear the way to the rich man's wealth. The value of the common air—even as the means of life—depends upon the good sense with which we use it; and if we lead a bad life, it were better if it were withdrawn altogether. And so the value of liberty to an individual or a people, depends wholly upon the disposition and the ability to use it wisely. The true glory of an individual man, is not, that he is a free moral agent, but that being such, he obeys the laws and all the laws of his being. The true glory of a State is not that it possesses free institutions, but that possessing them, it obeys the laws, and all the laws to which God in his providence will hold States accountable. This is precisely the idea which the people of this country entertain of liberty, civil, social, religious, and individual. It is definite. They do not undervalue it as a sentiment. They read and enjoy the eloquence and song which that sentiment has inspired. They have a ready sympathy for every people among whom that sentiment has awakened a struggle, now for the Hungarian, and not long since for the Greek. They welcome the graceful periods of Lamartine, and the eloquent letters and speeches of Kossuth. This is a natural and every way respectable homage to a universal sentiment. But when the question comes about liberty at home, we put this sentiment where all sentiments belong, under the discipline of the judgment. We are then extremely impatient with abstract discussion about the rights of men—we begin at the other end, and having ascertained how much liberty will be safe and useful to the individual and to the State, we infer that just so much liberty, and no more, is one of the rights of man in this country at this time. These ideas are practical. Perhaps we should convey our meaning more accurately, by calling them concrete. They are embodied in usages, institutions, and laws. We have passed the period of elementary instruction, and just as a boy throws aside his grammar, forgets all the rules, and uses the language correctly for the rest of his life, detecting at once any error in its use by another, so we have ceased to discuss the principles of liberty, and wear with graceful ease its time-honored institutions, and only stand to our arms when some one of these is attacked. When a man is restrained of his liberty, he is entitled to a writ, and an inquiry into the cause of his imprisonment. If the State charge him with a violation of law, he can have the opinion of twelve of his neighbors upon that matter. He can entertain or express any opinion without responsibility to the State, if he do not offend against public decency and order. These and the like comprise what the American citizen understands by the rights of man; and of

their possession he is so well assured that he does not think it necessary to make much talk about them, although if they were seriously in peril, he would defend them in a manner that would quickly reveal his origin and his education.

American ideas of liberty are inherited, and it is because they are so that they are so definite and practical. Nothing can with certainty be said to be valuable in human affairs, unless it come to us under the direct sanction of God, or has stood the test of time and experience. We are said to be a practical people, and we laugh at the crude notions upon this subject which prevail in Germany and France. But look into the early writers of our own language. They may have—we think they have—some advantage over these foreign writers in this respect, but it is plain that even to them the matter presents itself in vague and shadowy forms. Take such a writer as Algernon Sidney—an able man, and living at a period of English history comparatively recent and enlightened—any school-boy can correct his errors. It is the practical operation of government and society which has enabled us to bring civil and religious liberty to such perfection. Our liberties are of pure and noble blood. They have retired again and again before the crushing charge of power, with banners torn but flying; they have raised the song of triumph upon many a hard-fought field; they have borne their testimony meekly in the fires of martyrdom, and unquailingly before the sceptred anger of kings, and they have come at last to guard and protect a mighty people in their triumphant, exulting, and beneficent march over a continent. It is sometimes made matter of regret, that we as a nation have little in our past history to appeal to the imagination and the heart. We look to the land of our origin, and a line of kings reaching back into the clouds of fable, stirs the innate loyalty of the human heart; an aristocracy, some of whose ancestors bore pennons at the battle of Hastings, and others of whom were noble in England, when the Norman was a roving pirate in the northern seas, appeal to a natural love of dignity and power. There is some foundation for this, as the most democratic of us know, when an actual living Earl or Baron comes among us, we should not think any better of an American lady who would not like to have been the Dutchess of Devonshire, or of a surly democrat who would not be glad, if possible, to trace his descent from a Plantagenet, or a Tudor, or to take his seat in the House of Lords. But these things we must manage to dispense with; and we have sometimes thought that we might, by a little effort, invest some things which we actually have, with historical associations not wholly without power over the feelings and the imagination. King John and his Barons are dust, but

that which has made them immortal is in our possession ; and every man, as he rises to be sworn upon the petit jury, may gratify his pride by remembering that he does so by virtue of the courage which braved the tyrants on the field of Runnymede. Every citizen who has the ill-luck to be before the court upon a writ of Habeas Corpus, may console himself in his misfortunes, by remembering that he is enjoying a right which was gracefully yielded to his subjects by the Merry Monarch, and which no blandishments of flattery, and no frown of power, could ever recall. The humblest man who goes to the ballot-box and thus participates in the government which rules over him, may take pleasure in the reflection, that to secure him this right, one monarch perished on the scaffold and another died in exile. This liberty, thus definite, practical, and inherited, is part of the nation's life. Wherever any portion of this people go, they carry with them a well-ordered State. The Constitution of California is said to be the most perfect model of a free government known among men. Suppose a colony of Germans or Frenchmen should emigrate and attempt to form a government? This illustrates the difference between the vague sentiment of liberty and its practical understanding ; between liberty in theory and liberty in practice ; between liberty inherited and newly created. We all feel the force of this element of our power.

A people thus possessed of civil and religious liberty, and so intelligent, energetic and active, would naturally be a contented people ; and this contentment is itself an element of strength. But this requires explanation. That serene and tranquil frame of mind, which springs from self-discipline and control, from a just estimate of the relative value of things, and from a true balance of the faculties and habitual obedience to all laws in their due order, the American people have not, and few individuals among them have. We are restless, ill-tempered and one-sided, worrying ourselves through life in order that we may get ready to live—working too hard—pushing ourselves up in the world too fast—eating and drinking too much—in one word, we go by steam and electricity, from the cradle to the grave. Clearly we are not a contented, in the sense of being a happy people. But there is another kind of content which comes of having an object in view, and constant occupation. And this the American people have, and each individual has so much of it, that he cannot find time to help anybody else make a disturbance. If the time should ever come, when the opportunities of individual enterprise should be less, and these restless energies be left to seek a new channel, there will be danger ; but this is too remote to be measured and provided for now.

Here then we are, the best part of a continent in our hands, and the rest waiting till called for—with a population numbering some twenty-four millions, our increase during the last ten years greater than the whole population with which we went through the war of the Revolution; and this population not serfs, ignorant and brutish, like the subjects of Nicholas; nor Indians, effeminate and superstitious, like many of the subjects of her Majesty Queen Victoria: but energetic, active, intelligent men, who possess and know how to use steam-ships and steam-mills, the railway and the telegraph—the philosophy of Bacon, the faith of Luther, and the principles of Roger Williams; in short, Yankees of the nineteenth century. Is there any ground to fear for the prosperity of such a people, so situated?

We wish to guard against an impression which may have been produced by some of our remarks, that we have an undue admiration of the rude strength of society, and are indifferent to some of its more refined and subtle elements. We would be very glad to see wealth used with a broader humanity and a more far-seeing wisdom; diffusing itself among the abodes of honest and unfortunate poverty; multiplying institutions for the prevention of crime and the reformation of the criminal; undertaking and completing works of public improvement to strengthen and bless this and coming generations; endowing still more liberally all institutions of learning, from the common school to the college; covering the land with an architecture of more than Athenian beauty, and flowering out into galleries of art. Nor are we insensible to the vices and follies of society. There are things among us calling loudly for the prayers and the labors of the humble and the devout, and upon which it were well if the wit of Butler, the energy of Dryden, the caustic irony of Pope, and the fierce sarcasm of Junius, could concentrate all the laughter, scorn and contempt, which divine grace has left in the virtuous portion of the community. But "*non omnia possumus omnes.*" Our object has been to show that we possess all the elements of great prosperity, and that while we ought to be always sensible to the actual defects of society around us, and always willing to contribute to their removal, we have still great reasons to be proud and happy. In view of what we have, we think it is peevish to find fault because there are some things which we have not. They will come in due time. Meanwhile, it is well to remember that we are here not to have what we want, but to use wisely what we have, and that the sun in all his course looks not down upon, never has looked down upon, a nation of men more highly favored of Providence, and bearing on to their final account a greater weight of responsibility than the people of these United States, in this, the commencement of the last half of the nineteenth century.

ART. VI.—WORKS OF DR. WILLIAMS.

BY THE REV. A. C. KENDRICK, D. D., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER.

Religious Progress. Discourses on the Development of the Christian Character. By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1850.

Lectures on the Lord's Prayer. By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1851.

MORE than twenty years ago, we remember reading, in the American Baptist Magazine,* a biographical sketch of Rev. John Williams, who had removed to this country from Wales, and was for many years pastor of the Baptist Church, in Oliver-street, New-York. The article arrested our attention by the purity and grace of its style, and the brilliancy of its tone, and we felt that we were in contact with a mind on which God had set the unmistakable impress of genius. It was written, we learned, by Mr. William R. Williams, then a lawyer, recently admitted to the New-York bar, and was a tribute of filial piety to the virtues of a beloved and justly honored parent. We hope that this memoir may yet grace some future edition of the Miscellanies. Not far from this time, (we have not the dates,) at the call of his brethren, and under the irresistible convictions of his own soul, Mr. Williams exchanged his profession of law for the ministry of the Gospel, and entered upon that work in connection with the same church that has ever since enjoyed the privilege of his ministrations. From that time, by the singular purity and excellence of his personal character, by the depth and fervor of his piety, by the rich exuberance of his varied talents, by the wide range of his reading and erudition, he has steadily advanced to an eminent and honored place in the religious body to which he is attached, and has taken an undisputed rank among the first preachers and religious writers of the age. He has attained a reputation in which every Baptist may feel a just pride, as an additional evidence that Baptist principles are not, as some have supposed, necessarily connected, either in their origin or tendency, with ignorance and dullness.

* Sept., 1825.—Ed.

Indeed, the literary fortunes of the Baptist denomination have been not a little remarkable. Its eminently scriptural and simple church polity, its unswerving adherence to the New Testament ordinances, its uniform assertion of the doctrine of religious freedom, have often co-existed with a degree of humbleness and illiterateness on the part of its members, which naturally excited the contempt of those influential sects that filled the places of worldly power, and presided over the institutions and means of education. Yet, while the great mass of its adherents have been plain and unlearned, it has produced a few names of the very first distinction, and sufficient of themselves to redeem it from the reproach of intellectual barrenness. We pass over the name of Milton, who, though a Baptist in the peculiar doctrines which separate Baptists from other evangelical communions, dissented from them all in some important tenets of Scriptural faith. We pass over, too, a multitude of lesser, but highly respected names in the literary annals of our denomination. We point now only to the names of Bunyan, Fuller, Hall, Foster, Wayland, and Williams, as a constellation of genius, learning, and piety, which sheds a brilliant lustre on our denominational history. To distinguish and characterize the separate stars in this constellation—to portray at length the features of these eminent men—is a task beyond our powers, as it is aside from our present purpose. Bunyan, unfurnished with the lore of the schools, but profoundly taught in the mysteries of faith; homely in style, but pouring forth from a warm heart and a fervid imagination a torrent of pure, racy, masculine English; and by the suffrage, not only of the greatest literary critic of our day, but of the whole commonwealth of letters, taking his place alongside of the author of *Paradise Lost*, as one of the “two great creative minds” of the latter half of the seventeenth century:—Fuller, as great in the development of doctrinal, as Bunyan was of experimental Christianity; wholly unambitious of rhetorical embellishment, almost insensible to the mere pleasures of taste, but master of a style simple, perspicuous, and dignified, and perfectly adapted to the weighty and profound truths of which it was always the vehicle:—Hall, splendid, graceful, and majestic, with a large and various erudition, and a thorough intellectual training; master alike of the sternest weapons of logic, and “the dazzling fence of rhetoric;” in style, combining the sweetness of Addison with the sublimity of Burke; moving with easy and colossal tread through the highest regions of thought, and only prevented by a taste, delicate even to fastidiousness, from rising continually to the very loftiest heights of imaginative eloquence:—

Foster, rugged, gloomy, and original; always "putting a new face upon things;" always diving down to the depths, and laying bare the inmost anatomy of man's moral nature; utterly regardless of the mere melodies of style, but expressing himself with the most admirable precision, and clothing his thoughts in words and images of such picturesqueness and beauty, and in sentences of such clumsy construction, that Hall happily characterized them as "lumbering wagons, loaded with gold."—Wayland, the expounder of the principles of Moral Obligation, and of the Science of Christianity; clear, exact, and searching in analysis; penetrating to the very heart of his subject, and enunciating its ultimate principles in a style of transparent clearness and classical purity and elegance, and not unfrequently rising to strains of eloquence, which show us

"How sweet an Ovid was in Murray lost;"

how splendid an imagination has been reined in, and controlled by a severely chastised taste, and a predominating habit of metaphysical analysis:—and finally, Williams, sweeping along in a strain, of which we scarcely know which most to admire, the fertility and vigor of the thought, or the wealth of the illustration and beauty of the imagery. These are names which represent a treasure, intellectually and morally, of extraordinary value; a contribution to the literature of our denomination and our language which we cannot contemplate without pleasure and pride.

The works of these men should be on the shelves of every intelligent Baptist. He will find them a library in themselves, guiding him into almost every department and domain of religious thought. We are aware that, in the case of Hall and Foster, the benefit of the perusal, owing to their peculiar mental constitution and circumstances, is not without some drawbacks to ordinary minds. Neither was eminent as a theologian. Hall, conscious of splendid abilities, only came gradually into a full recognition, and under the complete sway of the doctrines of grace, and on the subject of communion his works advocate views at variance with the prevailing Baptist usages in this country. Foster was, in temperament, saturnine and gloomy; remote in his habitual subjects of thought from the ordinary range of Christian experience, and on that of future punishment, allowing himself, tremblingly indeed, in a latitude of speculation, which, consistently carried out, would go far to sap the foundations of evangelical faith. Still, these views by no means pervade his writings; and after making all allowance for whatever was peculiar in the talents and temperament of these extraordinary men, we repeat the ex-

pression of our wish, that the writings, so far as accessible, of all these lights of the church, may be found on the shelves, and often in the hands, of every one who owns the Baptist name. They are at present, we believe, read more extensively without the pale of our denomination than within it. We would not narrow the circle of their influence; we would rather enlarge it, by bringing them into closer familiarity with those who are the more immediate heirs of their treasures of pious thought and consecrated eloquence.

Of the noble list above enumerated, four sleep with the sainted and honored dead. Bunyan finished his testimony amidst the stormy times of the English Revolution. Fuller died in 1815, after a life of surpassing activity and usefulness. Hall, just twenty years ago, exchanged a life of almost perpetual agony for the rest of heaven; and only very recently his friend, Foster, has gone down to the tomb full of honors and of years. Wayland and Williams are among us in the vigor and maturity of their powers, ornaments and pillars of our American Zion. We shall incur no charge of exaggeration in placing their names alongside of those of the illustrious dead. Their writings, comparatively limited in quantity, are of a value which stamps them as classics in the language. They are living—they are among us—they are our own; and we must be permitted for a few moments longer to hold their names in juxtaposition. In the cast and structure of their minds they are, indeed, widely different. Dr. Wayland, although an accomplished scholar, makes, we presume, no pretension to the almost unlimited range of erudition which characterizes his younger contemporary. Dr. Williams, although a vigorous and original thinker, would readily yield the palm to Dr. Wayland, in respect to the power and habits of close logical reasoning and analysis. Dr. Wayland is a sound scholar, and a distinguished thinker; Dr. Williams is a sound thinker, and a distinguished scholar. Dr. Wayland illustrates but sparingly from history, but always with great propriety and effect; Dr. Williams almost overwhelms us with the affluence of his historical illustrations. In Dr. Wayland, the metaphysical element predominates over the rhetorical; in Dr. Williams, the rhetorical and imaginative are more conspicuous than the metaphysical. Dr. Wayland seeks to present truth in its most abstract and general expression; Dr. Williams, to embody it in some striking incident or image. The style of the two is as widely diverse as their modes of thinking. That of Dr. Wayland has the advantage in perspicuity, simplicity, and classical finish and elegance; that of Dr. Williams excels in the abundance with which it pours forth beautiful

thought and imagery, careless of graces, and yet perpetually snatching graces beyond the reach of art. A page of Dr. Wayland is an English landscape, chastened by tasteful cultivation into severe beauty and regulated fertility; a page of Dr. Williams is an American forest—a wilderness of untamed magnificence and beauty. Dr. Wayland reminds us of a Grecian temple, wrought of the most precious materials into the most perfect symmetry and proportion; Dr. Williams, of a Gothic cathedral, gorgeous in its manifold decorations, resounding with organ melodies, and clustering with the solemn associations of the Middle Ages.

Both are far from being mere men of the closet. Both are “men of thought and men of action;” men of ready practical, as well as of profound theoretical wisdom. Both have not only plenty of bullion dug out from the mines of thought, and stored up in the capacious chambers of their intellects, but (what many great men have not) plenty of change for the ordinary currency of life. Both have a constant and keen eye upon the great moral and political changes which are going forward in society; and while, on the whole decidedly conservative in their principles, have a warm and deep sympathy with every movement which tends to the world’s disenthralment and elevation. Both exert a powerful influence in our religious organizations and deliberative assemblies. The noble and majestic form of Dr. Wayland enforces the sentiments of wisdom which he so eloquently utters; the slender frame and shrinking modesty of Dr. Williams lend an indescribable charm to the rich melodies of thought and speech that tremble from his tongue, and seem to gush in a resistless torrent from his soul.

From the pens of both, the American Church has yet much to hope and to expect. We should regard it as a great calamity to the cause of letters and religion, should either lay aside his pen before giving us many more of the fruits of his large experience and matured powers. Dr. Williams is understood to be accumulating materials for a work, to which the wishes of his brethren have long destined him, the preparation of a history of the Church, in special connection with that of his own denomination. May God spare his life to bring the work to a happy completion!—and yet we should regret that even a work of this magnitude should prevent his giving to the public some more such volumes as those whose titles stand at the head of our article. Dr. Wayland has consented, we learn, to undertake the biography of that apostle of Modern Missions, the late Dr. Judson. No more appropriate designation could have been made. It was fitting that such a Christian

scholar should commemorate the deeds of such a Christian hero; that he whose sermon on the Moral Dignity of the Missionary Enterprise, thrilled and fired, in the infancy of that enterprise, the heart of the church universal, and did more than any other single cause to enthrone it in the respect and admiration of the civilized world, should record the achievements, and delineate the character, of him in whom, of all modern men, the sublimity of the missionary principle has been the most perfectly embodied.

But it is time to turn to the more immediate subject of our present paper. It is matter of just congratulation to the public, that Dr. Williams has at length come forward with a more formal claim upon its attention, than in the occasional single discourses which he had previously published. We rejoice that he has taken his place distinctly in the field of religious authorship. Such as have had the privilege of sharing his private intercourse, and of listening to him in meetings of business and debate, have known that the productions of his pen, the noble discourses which he has laid before the public, were little more than specimens of the habitual products of his mind. We have heard him on topics that sprung up casually in the turn of a debate, where all previous preparation was precluded, give utterance, on the spur of the moment, to an argument as complete and compact, couched in language as finished and graceful, and at once adorned and enforced by as ample a fund of illustration, as are, perhaps, to be met even in his more elaborate discourses.

Indeed, nothing in Dr. Williams is more striking than his uniform and complete command of his powers; the promptness and dexterity with which he marshals, and, with the speed of light, concentrates his intellectual resources. It seems as if that capacious memory had gathered every fact in the wide domain of art and science, and more especially of sacred, civil, and literary history, and held them all in perfect subordination, ready in an instant to accumulate their whole force on the point to be defended or assailed. Dr. Williams's mind has no every-day and Sunday dress. He is not, like Goldsmith, common-place in conversation, but brilliant with the pen. He is rather like Goldsmith's celebrated and gigantic contemporary, Johnson, whose ordinary conversation conveyed lessons of not inferior wisdom, and couched in language of purer and more nervous eloquence, than his writings. In Johnson, and probably in Robert Hall, the advantage in sententious energy was on the side of their extemporaneous efforts. The mind of neither was sufficiently simple and self-oblivious to be entirely natural, when consciously approaching the great tribunal of

the public. Williams is Williams everywhere. His intellect is too active and rapid not to do itself justice on the most ordinary occasions; while he is too thoroughly absorbed in his subject to let the fear of criticism influence his more elaborate performances. We have no great respect for Boswell. Macaulay tells us that it was not merely in spite, but because of his being one of the most despicable men that ever lived, that he produced one of the best biographies that were ever written. But we almost wish Dr. Williams could be *Boswellized*. There are few men, we think, the every-day effusions of whose intellect would yield so rich a banquet of wisdom.

Were we to attempt an analysis of Dr. Williams's characteristics as a writer, we should assign the first place to the eminent spirituality and devotion evinced in his works; not merely to their uniform recognition of, but their thorough baptism in, the great truths of evangelical religion. The gospel, as a scheme for man's redemption, and a code of human duty, reigns supreme in his affections, and he bows to the sway of its truths, his whole intellectual and moral nature. Few writers bring out in greater richness, the glorious doctrines of the gospel; and fewer still, unfold so fully their bearing on all the duties, relations, and interests of men. Dr. Williams is a theologian; but we think not strictly a metaphysical theologian. He holds, we doubt not, a clearly defined and well-adjusted system of Scripture doctrines, and is well read in the theology of our own and of former times. But the form under which he loves to contemplate divine truth, is not that of a system of abstract dogmas, bound together by logical affinities, but of practical principles, pervading the affairs, and controlling the destinies of men; the pivots around which human society revolves; the grand nervous network distributed through the entire social body, and bringing it into vital contact with the Supreme and Infinite Mind. In the light of religious truth, he contemplates all the facts of human history and human life; and with great freedom and justness brings religious principles to bear on every department of human action. In all the changes of society, he sees but the evidences of a God honored or disobeyed; of moral principle heeded or trampled under foot.

Another feature of Dr. Williams's writings is the extensive reading and erudition which they display. His varied and universal knowledge, like the gold of California, crops out at every point, and forces itself forth in an unfailing opulence of illustration and imagery. There is, indeed, no parade of learning. Although a scholar from the cradle, and thoroughly versed both in the original languages of Scripture, and in the languages and literature of Modern Europe, yet he rarely puts

himself before the public in the attitude, or with the pretensions, of a scholar. Yet every page teems with the evidences of a richly stored mind; of a mind that has gathered its treasures not merely in the ordinary and beaten walks of knowledge, but in regions which only few minds enter, and still fewer thoroughly explore. Dr. Williams's acquaintance with history—a study of which he seems peculiarly fond—is equally comprehensive and profound. To adopt his own striking figure, he is equally ready to do battle with the enemy at the gates, and to shift his ground to the graves of the Fathers and the monuments of the old past. We know of no religious writer of our times, unless it be Isaac Taylor, nor of any secular writer except Macaulay, who revels in so rich a store of knowledge respecting all the great movements and aspects of the church and the world, both in our own and former times. The most obscure and recondite epochs and sections of church history, he seems thoroughly to have explored. The whole cycle of changes through which infidel philosophy has passed, its scoffing, its speculative, its scientific, its transcendental, and its socialist aspects—with all he seems equally familiar, and against all he levels his powerful artillery.

This affluence of illustration, especially of historical illustration, imparts to the pages of Dr. Williams a very marked character. Names which really appear in pulpit discourses, the names of philosophers, statesmen, poets, infidels, as well as of Patriarchs, Apostles, and Fathers of the Church, are of constant recurrence in his writings. In this, we think he judges wisely. There is, we believe, a prevailing prejudice in our churches against the introduction, to any considerable extent, of names and incidents from secular history; and some clergymen systematically confine all their historical references within the limits of the Sacred Narratives. Whatever may be the origin of this prejudice, we are convinced that it is a prejudice, and that our educated preachers would add to the freshness and interest of their discourses by bringing them into contact at a larger number of points with human life, and especially by widening their range of historical illustration. We grant that no uninspired narrative can rival, in importance and interest, those of the Sacred record. We grant that there is probably no principle of truth and duty of which they do not somewhere furnish an illustration. But so does the Lord's Prayer surpass in weight and fullness of meaning, any supplication ever breathed from human lips, and enfolds in some one of its clauses the substance of every aspiration which the human heart can utter to its God. With just as much propriety, therefore, might we cast all our supplications into the mould fur-

nished by the great Author of prayer, as circumscribe our lessons of instruction from the Divine Government, whether in or out of the pulpit, by that narrow, though pregnant section of it comprised within the Sacred narratives. Take the periods from which Dr. Williams draws some of his most impressive illustrations: The Epoch of the Protestant Reformation; the period of English history which witnessed the conflict between the stern piety of the Puritan, and the brilliant profligacy of the Cavalier; the age of riotous infidelity which found its culminating point and fitting climax in the horrors of the French Revolution. These periods approach near to our own day. They fostered principles and originated states of society, of which we yet feel the influence. And shall not the teacher of religion be permitted to single out from these and other periods, such striking examples as may, either by conformity or contrast, enforce the great truths which he delivers? Studying the Lord's Prayer, teaches us how to pray. Studying the history of the Bible, teaches us how to read all history; furnishes the key with which we are to unlock its secrets; the light in which we are to decipher and interpret the otherwise inexplicable hieroglyphics—the Menes and Tekels—the words of fate and doom which the finger of God's providence inscribes on the palace walls of empires.

We are aware of the necessary conditions of our recommendation. He who would illustrate from history, must *know* history, and that not superficially, but thoroughly. If ministers made themselves at home in any branch or section of history, they could not refrain from allusions to it on befitting occasions. Here is one of the strong points of Dr. Williams: He has studied the chronicles of former times, until he lives in the past, as other men live in the present. He has but to start an idea, and names and facts come clustering round it to bring it within the recognized sphere of human experience, to give it at once life and confirmation. He has read history not only deeply, but in the devout spirit of a Christian. With him, practically as well as theoretically, the God of Nature, of Providence, and of Revelation, is one God; and wherever he sees the footprints of that Glorious Being, wherever he sees a blessing following obedience to him, and disobedience linked to its inevitable curse, he does not hesitate to seize and hold up the lesson.

But wide as has been Dr. Williams's reading, large as is his stock of erudition, it has not overlaid and smothered his powers of original and independent thinking. His writings display everywhere an intellect equally active and vigorous; a mind that makes its own observations, that draws its own conclu-

sions, and uses its large stores of information, not as substitutes, but materials for thought. His mind never rests upon the surface of his facts, but pierces below to the principle which they embody; and it is in illustration of that principle that they marshal themselves on his page. We will not say that his historical facts do not sometimes mislead him; that an illustration does not sometimes impose itself upon him as an argument; and that sometimes his mind does not seem to be overburdened by his multifarious acquisitions. It would be strange, indeed, if such were not the case. Yet rarely, we think, is learning so various accompanied by original powers of so high an order. Rarely are large treasures of intellectual wealth so little oppressive to their possessor. Rarely is an intellectual armor so heavy and complete, adjusted so perfectly to its wearer, and borne and wielded with so much ease.

But along with a large fund of knowledge and powers of thinking of a high order, Dr. Williams's writings evince an uncommonly brilliant and fervid imagination. This fuses and blends into harmony all his powers and acquisitions, imparts to his pages, ever, fresh life and interest, and causes them to teem with the most striking and beautiful imagery. Indeed, Dr. Williams thinks in metaphor; his figures are not after-thoughts, superinduced upon his style for illustration or embellishment; they are wrought into the very texture of his thought; they are the form, the body, which it naturally and almost necessarily assumes. We must be permitted to string together a few of those pearls of imagery with which his writings abound. We take them almost at random. In the *Miscellanies*, (p. 6,) he says of Literature, that "It is the Nilometer on whose graded scale we read not merely the height to which the rushing stream of the nation's intellect has risen, or the degree to which it has sunk, but also the character and extent of the harvests yet to be reaped in coming months along the whole course of these waters."

The following, from *Religious Progress*, p. 48, is a beautiful specimen at once of historical illustration and bold metaphor. The "roll-call of the dead" is a conception which belongs to the noblest class of imagery.

"Those who have attained, are honored, and presented as patterns and incentives for the emulation of those who come after. "Being dead, they yet speak." It was a touching memorial to their comrade, the warrior of Breton birth, La Tour d'Auvergne, the first grenadier of France, as he was called, when after his death, his comrades insisted that, though dead, his name should not be removed from the rolls: it was still regularly called, and one of the survivors as regularly answered for the departed soldier: "Dead on the field." The eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is such roll-call of the dead. It is the register of a regiment, which will not

allow death to blot names from its page, but records the soldiers who have, in its ranks, won honorable graves and long-abiding victories."—P. 48.

"As Geology scratches the rind of our globe, some are hoping to dig up and fling out before the nations a contradiction to the oracles of the earth's Creator; and to find a birth-mark on the creature that shall impeach the truth of its Maker's registers as to its age and history.—P. 21.

"Faith does not assume to dissect away the Divine Justice from the Divine Mercy. It was a fraudulent claimant to the sacred title of mother, who at the throne of Solomon, asked the division of the living child. And it is but a spurious faith, and a forged Christianity, that would hew apart, at the foot of the Mercy Seat, the living Christ, and taking his grace, leave His holiness."—P. 47.

"Man has capacities and aspirations that the earthly, the perishable, the finite and the sinful can never satisfy. In tenderness to our race, God commands them to seek in Himself, in the knowledge of His nature and will, and in communion with Him, those enjoyments that nought lower and less than Himself can furnish. We can easily conceive, in the lower orders of creation, how unhappy it were that a being of higher endowments and long duration, should be decreed to mate with, and hang upon one of much inferior nature and of shorter date than itself. If, for instance, the aloe, the plant of centuries, were fated to be the appendage and parasite of the ephemeron, the insect of a day, it would be doomed virtually to early and lonely widowhood by the untimely decay of its idol, and the perfect inadequacy and early rottenness of its appointed prop. The soul, with its unrenounceable immortality, and its infinite aspirations, is such plant of the long centuries, an aloe of the eternities beyond this world. Did God permit man to accept as supreme standard, and object, and end, aught finite, mortal and imperfect, it would be mating this, his creature, to inevitable disappointment and boundless misery."—P. 51.

The style of Dr. Williams is in harmony with the above characteristics; it is always racy, vigorous, and eloquent, with a certain quaintness and tinge of the antique, in which we discern the writer's familiarity with the authors of the seventeenth century. Not that it bears any marks of formal imitation; its beauties, and they are great, and its faults, which are not wanting, are all his own. There is nothing stereotyped, nothing common-place; his mind shakes itself free from all conventional superficialities, strikes into the heart of the subject, and as it pursues its unbeaten way, turns up perpetually new and striking beauties of diction and imagery. Of our author it may be emphatically said, "*nil quod tetigit non ornavit*,"—he adorns whatever he teaches. The most common-place theme opens into richness beneath his handling; the most common-place thought starts into beauty beneath the magic of his pen. His style has great breadth, variety and power. In the richness and warmth of its coloring—in the fullness and loftiness of its march—in its occasional irregularities and negligence of the minor graces of expression, it reminds us of Chalmers, between whose mind and that of Dr. Williams there are some strong points of analogy. His

words are felicitously chosen, or rather, they hardly seem to be chosen at all, but gush spontaneously forth as the natural and appropriate embodiment of the thought. They have great freedom and freshness, and in their imaginative and picturesque character, they remind us of the quality which Macaulay ascribes to Milton, and which is also eminently characteristic of Foster. They are *charmed* words. They suggest to the imagination more than they convey directly to the intellect. They open far-reaching vistas, through which the mind looks out on either side of that luminous track along which the author is conducting it.

The faults of Dr. Williams's style are closely allied to his excellences. It would probably be objected to as too ornate, too prolific of imagery. His mind is a tropical region, in which fruits and flowers of extraordinary beauty are poured forth even in rank luxuriance. The mind of the reader sometimes asks the repose of a diction more simple and severe. Such, however, is the constitution of Dr. Williams's mind; he could not change it if he would; and we neither expect nor wish that he should make the attempt. Had Burke or Chalmers been asked to rein in, and bring down to a somewhat juster level, their sweeping and majestic march of diction, and to chasten into perfect taste their exuberant and gorgeous imagery, they would probably have disregarded the requirement; or, in attempting compliance, would have sacrificed far higher excellences than they would have gained. Many spots that dim their lustre would have been removed, but the lustre itself would have gone with them. We should have had abundance of correctness, but we should not have had Burke and Chalmers. Style is inseparably allied to thought—it is the image and expression of the writer's mind; and to ask any radical change in it, is to ask a radical revolution in his modes of thinking.

What we would ask from Dr. Williams is, a more frequent "turning of the style," a greater severity in the work of revision. Let him "write with fury," but correct with somewhat more of "phlegm." Subjects so important as those which he discusses, thoughts so weighty as those which he utters, are worthy of being put forth in the very best form which he can bestow upon them. Some of his productions bear the marks of haste; the structure of the sentences is not unfrequently negligent and ungraceful—sometimes obscure—and sometimes clogged by repetitions. A sentence is not unfrequently drawn out by the addition of clauses, which would much better form a new and independent construction. We might give many examples of these blemishes, especially from

the Discourses on Religious Progress, but we think it unnecessary. We will merely cite one or two from his works indiscriminately. On the first page of the Miscellanies we have the sentence: "You know how the physical condition of a people may remain unchanged, whilst the moral condition of a people is deteriorating rapidly and fatally." The repetition of "of a people," here strikes us as ungraceful. So in the sentence but one immediately preceding: "Acting on the homes of a land—it must send out its waters—over the length and breadth of our goodly land;" the construction is certainly wanting in unity and compactness. On page 38 of "Religious Progress," the sentence commencing, "Nay, in your own hearts," furnishes an instance of hasty and even inaccurate construction. Constructions like the following, occasionally occurring, we cannot approve: "Till the Sabbath was stript of its legitimate honors, of its sanctities not only, but of its decencies even." The phrase, "far as," for "as far as," appears frequently in these pages. It is admissible in poetry, but in prose is inelegant, except in the sense of "however far," which is not our author's mode of using it. Our author is also unmerciful in his use of the conjunction "and," in an enumeration of particulars, as A, and B, and C. We need hardly say, that in respect to this there are three classes of constructions: first, the *asyndeton*, or entire omission of the connecting particle; second, its omission between all the terms of the series, except the two last; and, finally, its insertion between them all. The second of these is the ordinary construction. The first is favorable to condensed energy, and is in frequent use with Demosthenes. The last is occasionally proper for rhetorical amplification, or for detaining the members of the series under the mind of the reader. Dr. Williams's use of it is sometimes very striking, but he employs it, on the whole, so constantly and indiscriminately, as frequently to encumber his sentences, and deprive the figure of nearly all its legitimate effect.

One more, of these little matters, and we dismiss them. The style of Dr. Williams is highly figurative, and often has a tinge of the poetic. To this we make no objection; it is the secret, doubtless, of much of its fascination. We might, indeed, express our surprise that a mind so poetically constituted, so fertile in poetic diction and imagery, should so rarely give to its thoughts the garb of poetical quotation. We scarcely remember to have met half a dozen citations from the poets in the whole range of his works, hardly more than are to be found in the single discourse on the Moral Dignity of the Missionary Enterprise. How much poetical taste and feel-

ing Dr. Williams may have smothered beneath the heavy tomes of patristic and Jesuitical lore, we do not know; but we rather think that Burns and Shakspeare are more frequently in the hands of the metaphysical President than of the imaginative Divine. We merely glance at the fact as a little curious; as showing how qualities, apparently uncongenial, are often found united; how the flowers of poesy (whose presiding genius is imagination) may sometimes leave a soil teeming with the luxuriance of a fervid fancy, to shed their sweets and blossoms over the colder region of metaphysics. But this was not the point of our present remark. We were going merely to object to his frequent use of certain words, which we believe are ordinarily interdicted to the writer of prose, and claimed as the peculiar heritage of the poets. Among these are "oft," for "often;" "ere," for "before;" and, in most cases, "aught" and "nought," for "anything," and "nothing." Dr. Williams would not use the poetic "morn" and "eve," for "morning" and "evening;" and, to us, the words above cited seem but little better. We think the substitution of the customary prose forms, in these and kindred cases, would give to his style more manliness and dignity.

But we will have done with this minute criticism. We are sure Dr. Williams will not regard it as unkindly meant. The faults which we speak of here, spring partly from haste, partly from too great an indifference to mere matters of language, and partly, we think, from the character of the author's studies, which have often led him into regions remote from the walks of elegant literature, fields on which the dews of Castaly have never been distilled. These blemishes affect mainly the embroidery, not the substance of his style. They are such as, with his nice ear and delicate appreciation of the beautiful, a little attention would easily remove, leaving his works the gainer far more than in proportion to the labor expended. Were his writings of less intrinsic excellence, we should feel less solicitude on this point; but they are destined to become, or rather already have taken their place among our religious classics, and will convey their lessons of theoretical and practical godliness to increasing thousands in coming generations. In proportion, then, to their intrinsic value, and the extent and elevation of the sphere which they are destined to fill, is our desire that they should be freed from everything that may impair their beauty, or hinder their usefulness. According to the preciousness of the substance, we would have the perfection of the form. The finish of the work should correspond with the richness of the material. Our appeal in this matter is not merely to Dr. Williams's regard for his literary reputation. It

rests on higher considerations. Thousands are affected by beauties or faults of composition, who never analyze their mental processes, and are totally unable to explain the cause of their emotions. A perspicuous, transparent style, like a pure atmosphere, revealing every object in its true form and color, has a powerful effect alike on the most cultivated, and the most illiterate—the latter will be moved, they know not why; the former will enjoy, with added zest, those beauties of thought and sentiment, which are enhanced by the graces of appropriate and finished diction.

But it is more than time to turn from these general remarks, extended far beyond our original purpose, to the works before us; and to give to such of our readers as have not had the pleasure of their perusal, some account of their contents, and a sample or two of their quality. The first on our list is entitled "Religious Progress," and consists of a series of discourses founded on that striking passage of II. Peter: "And besides all this, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity."

We learn from the Dedication that the sermons were prepared and published at the suggestion of Rev. Elisha Tucker, recently of Chicago; and in this, Dr. Tucker has added another to the many obligations of gratitude under which the Church has been laid by a long, laborious, and useful ministry. The series is introduced by a sermon founded on the word "add," which discusses religion as a principle of growth; and this is followed by a discourse upon each of the graces named in the text. We have thus a beautiful development of the subjects of faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity, or love. The nature of each grace is explained; its relation to its sister graces as their complement or natural antecedent, is skilfully unfolded; and then the importance and claims of each, urged with great fervency and power. The work, as a whole, is a noble tribute to the truth, efficacy, and glory of the great principles of the gospel. No Christian can read it without feeling the foundations of his religious faith strengthened, and fresh springs of religious joy and consolation opened; and no unbeliever can read it without a secret conviction, that here is a philosophy infinitely transcending the highest wisdom of earth; a philosophy that goes to the deepest springs of human character, and furnishes the true key to human destiny. It is a timely work. It proceeds from a mind which is penetrated with the glorious truths of the gospel, and reflects, like an im-

mense mirror, the manifold aspects of the age, notes the various phases of religious error and unbelief, and shows how they all "lose discountenanced, and like folly show," by the side of the divine wisdom of the Bible.

We wish we had time for an analysis of some of these discourses, and a discussion of their separate peculiarities. We have been struck by the great freedom and variety of structure which they exhibit. There is no stereotyped form into which they are all cast, but each has its own outline and analysis, according to the exigencies of its particular theme. The first discourse treats of "Religion as a principle of growth." The author here first discusses those religious and secular features of the age, which require that the progressive energy of Christianity be now especially heeded; and then alike from the general provisions of the gospel for human sanctification, and from the peculiar phraseology of the text, he illustrates and enforces his position. Under the first general head he considers the age in its religious aspects: 1. As an age of Missions; 2. As an age of Revivals; 3. As an age of Historical Research; and again, in its secular aspects, as an age, 1. Of rapid and eager discovery in the Physical Sciences; 2. Of Political Revolutions; 3. Of Social Reform. In this catalogue of the leading features of the age, the reflecting reader will be struck with the justness, and we may add, the completeness of the inventory. The treatment of all these topics is able; and of some, strikingly so. We cannot forbear to enrich our article with the following, on the present as a Missionary age:

"The church, we said, needs in this age to be kept in mind of the great truth, that there remains yet much land to be possessed; not only as the common heritage of the faithful, but as the personal allotment and homestead, so to speak, of each one of the faithful. The churches, re-discovering a long neglected duty, are now attempting to evangelize the heathen. It is an *age of missions*. The islands of the Pacific have heard the cry, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, that our earth has been honored and blessed by the coming of a Divine Redeemer. China has shuddered to see the long dominion, of her Confucius and her Boodh, invaded by the gospel of Jesus the Nazarene. The Shasters of Brahminism find their sacred Sanscrit tongue employed, by the diligence and fidelity of missionary translators, to utter the oracles of that One True God, who will banish from under the heavens which they have not made, and which He has made, all the hundred thousand gods of the Hindoo Pantheon, with all the other idols of the nations, however ancient and however popular. The tinglings of a new life from on high seem, along the coasts of Asia and of Africa, shooting into nations that Paganism held for centuries senseless and palsied. Is not Ethiopia soon to be, as the prophetic eye of the Psalmist long ages ago saw her, stretching out her hands unto God? But whilst each Christian church, each band of spiritual disciples, in lands long evangelized, is thus lengthening the cords of her tent to take in the Gentiles under its broad canopy, she must in consequence, and as it were in counterpoise, of the extension

strengthen her stakes at home, to bear the increased tension and the extended shelter. Her supports must be proportionately augmented at home, by a deepening piety and a sturdier vigor of principle in her discipleship, or the work will soon come to a stand abroad. A sickly and be-dwarfed Christianity here will not furnish the requisite laborers, or the needful funds. Expansion without solidity will bring upon our Zion the ruin of the arch unduly elongated and heavily overloaded. Christendom itself must be more thoroughly Christianized, before Heathendom will relinquish its old character and worship, and learn our creed and love our Saviour. Already the zeal and heroic sacrifices of some of our recent converts shame and should stimulate the comparative wordliness and lukewarmness of the churches that had first sent to them the missionary and the Bible."—P. 16.

We also add the paragraph on the scientific aspects of the age :

"The world, falsely or with justice, is shouting its own progress, and promising, in the advancement of the masses, the moral development of the individual. It is an age of eager and rapid discovery in the *Physical Sciences*. The laws and uses of matter receive profound investigation, and each day are practically applied with some new success. But some of the philosophers thus busied about the material world, seem to think that the world of mind is virtually a nonentity. As Geology scratches the rind of our globe, some are hoping to dig up and fling out before the nations a contradiction to the oracles of the earth's Creator, and to find a birth-mark on the creature that shall impeach the truth of its Maker's registers as to its age and history. Others, in the strides of Astronomy, along her star-paved way, hope to see her travel beyond the eye of the Hebrew Jehovah, and bringing back from her far journey a denial of the word that His lips have uttered. Yet Physical Science can certainly neither create nor replace Moral Truth. The crucible of the chemist cannot disintegrate the human soul, or evaporate the Moral Law. The Decalogue, and the Sermon on the Mount, Conscience and Sin, the superhuman majesty and purity of Christ, the Holy Ghost and the Mercy Seat, would remain, even if a new Cuvier and another Newton should arise, to carry far higher, and to sink far deeper, than it has ever yet done, the line of human research; and even if these new masters of physical lore should blaspheme where the older teachers may have adored. Some claim that Revelation must be recast, to meet the advances in Natural Science. They overlook the true limitations as to the power and prerogatives of mere Material Knowledge. And what are the new and loftier views of man's origin and destiny which these reformers propose to substitute for those views which they would abolish? On the basis of a few hardy generalizations upon imaginary or distorted facts, and by the aid of some ingenious assumptions, a system is excogitated that is to strip the race of immortality, conscience, and accountability, and that represents us as but a development of the ape, to be one day superseded by some being of yet nobler developments than our own, and who will have the right to rule and kill us, as we now rule and kill the beasts of the forest. And is it thus that Philosophy reforms upon the Bible? No—in the endeavor to outgrow Revelation, it has but succeeded in outgrowing reason, and brutifying humanity. No—let science perfect yet more her telescopes, and make taller her observatories, and deeper her mines, and more searching her crucibles; all will not undermine Jehovah's throne, or sweep out of the moral heavens the great star-like truths of Revelation, and least of all the Son of Righteousness. God's omniscience is never to be ultimately brought down to, and schooled by, man's nescience, as its last

standard and test. The last and greatest of the world's scholars will, we doubt not, be among the lowliest worshippers, and the loudest heralds of the crucified Nazarene. The gospel is true—true intensely, entirely and eternally: and all other and inferior truth, as it shall be more patiently and thoroughly evolved, will assume its due place and proportion, as buttressing and exalting the great, pervading, controlling incarnate Truth—Christ the Maker, the Sovereign, the Upholder, and the Judge, no less than the Redeemer of the world."

But we pass to the next discourse, which is entitled, "Faith the Root of the Christian Life." After a characteristic and appropriate introduction, the author inquires: I. "What is Faith; II. Why it has assigned (to) it this priority in the Christian system; and III. How, from the necessity of its nature, it becomes a root of spiritual growth and practical development." Under the first head, he shows that faith "is not the mere hereditary and passive acquiescence in Christianity, as the religion of our country and of our forefathers. Nor is it a reception into the intellect merely, apart from the heart, of any creed, however orthodox. Nor is it a mere enthusiastic persuasion, without Scriptural evidence, and unsustained by the warrant and witness of the Holy Ghost, that God loves us personally. Nor is it, as the enemies of religion would persuade you, a blind, bigoted credulity, the creature and retainer of Priestcraft." He goes on to show that the whole frame-work and action of human society are based upon faith; and adds, "The faith of the gospel is something more than these, only as being trust in God. It is trust, as to matters of higher concernment, and upon better warrant, and in a Greater and Better Being. It is a reliance on his true testimony." "As the great theme of this divine testimony is Christ Jesus, the Incarnation of God for the redemption of man, Faith cannot truly receive that testimony without believing on Christ."

Of the correctness of the statements made above, as to faith, there can, we presume, be no doubt. Still, we must be permitted to question, whether the author has put the subject in its happiest light; whether he has not subordinated faith in Christ to trust in God, in a manner not strictly accordant with the general tenor of the New Testament. The statement of Dr. Williams, if we understand it, is, that faith is trust in God; and because the great theme of his testimony is Jesus Christ, therefore faith accepts or believes on Christ. Would it not be stating the faith of the Gospel more exactly to say, that it believes on Christ, accepts his testimony, and believes in God, because it cannot receive the testimony of Christ without receiving and confiding in Him, whose messenger and witness He was? The difference is, perhaps, mainly or nearly verbal; yet not, we think, wholly devoid of practical importance. Christ, we

think, should be presented distinctly as the centre and prime object of gospel faith; and we believe that the same remark holds substantially of the faith of Old Testament believers.

We have a remark or two to make on Dr. Williams's treatment of the second head. He assigns four reasons why the priority should be given to faith in the Christian system; one derived from *man's past history*, inasmuch as sin originated in unbelief; the second, from *the nature respectively of God and man*, faith being essential to our receiving the teachings of the Infinite mind on subjects which our finite reason cannot grasp; a third, drawn from *the goodness of God*, which assigns as the initiatory element of the Christian life, not talents, not profound learning, but an exercise to which the child is as competent as the sage; and a fourth, from *man's besetting sin*, the pride, which clings to him since the fall, and makes it "fitting that the mode of his acceptance before God should be one that allowed no occasion for boasting." These reasons are all ingenious, striking, and, so far as they go, just; but, after all, are they the *real reason* why faith is made to "keep the gate of everlasting life?" Has not Dr. Williams passed over the *one* true reason growing out of the nature and necessity of the case? If we understand him, we suppose him to intimate that there is something in a degree arbitrary in the assignment of this post to faith. It was a matter of expediency, and some other grace might have been selected thus to lead the choir of Christian virtues, and initiate us into the Christian life. It strikes us differently; and we will, as briefly as possible, state our view. Man is a ruined sinner, entirely unable to redeem himself from the captivity of sin, or to pay the penalty of the law which he has broken. Under these circumstances a Substitute presents himself. Jesus Christ appears, and pays the debt which the sinner has incurred; submits to the penalty, and satisfies the demands of the law. What further is necessary? Why, that a relation be established between the Substitute and him on whose behalf he appears. How is that relation effected? We answer, by the sinner's *acceptance* of Christ as his ransom and deliverer. He must *believe* on him; must trust in him; must first confide in his ability and willingness to perform the work required, and then must formally commit, confide his case into his hands. We grant that every Christian grace is in exercise in the performance of this duty; that *love* must be in action as well as faith. But the specific *form* which this great initiatory step in the Christian life assumes, seems to us to be necessarily that of faith; and therefore the true reason why God assigns the post of honor and priority to faith, is because the circumstances of

the case require it. We can scarcely doubt that this is substantially the view held by Dr. Williams, and that it is through mere inadvertence that he has failed to include it in his representation.

Henceforward we go on in entire harmony with our author. From the discourse on Faith we must present one extract, on the character of the Scriptures, as tending to expand and nourish this grace.

"The growth set before our faith appears, again, from the *character and structure of Scripture*, the volume on whose testimonies faith fastens, and in whose rich pastures she must ever feed. God might have made it a book to be exhausted at one reading; or a record of the Past, unavailing to the men of the Present; or a mysterious outline of the Future, of little clearness or usefulness till the times of its fulfilment had come. Instead of this, it is a book of all times, full of the ancient Past, and the busy Present, and the dread or gorgeous Future. It has the simplest teachings interwoven inextricably with its most fathomless mysteries; and precept, and promise, and threatening, and history, and parable, and psalm, so grouped that every taste may be gratified, and none sated and cloyed. A Newton, sitting down to its perusal, finds it still opening new depths of wonder and glory, the more prolonged and devout are his meditations upon it. The new convert, dazzled over its pages with the ecstasy of his new-found hope, yet cannot as deeply and ardently love and value it as he will do when a gray-headed patriarch, years after, he turns afresh its wondrous leaves, to adore the ever-full freshness of its lessons, and to remember all the lights it has cast upon his weary pathway. It is the book, not of an academic lustrum only, nor of a lifetime, but of generations. As centuries have rolled on, this august volume has notched on their calendar new fulfilments of its prophecies, new illustrations of its truthfulness, and new evidences that its authorship could come from none other than the Former of the worlds, and the Ruler of all centuries. Now, when Faith is presented with such a manual, not to be mastered in weeks or years, but still evolving new lights to the latest studies of the longest lifetime, does not the character and structure of the book proclaim the intent of God, that Faith should not sit down content with present attainments, and its as yet immature strength?"

The next discourse is on virtue. "Add to your faith *virtue*." The author here justly and beautifully defines the character of virtue, which he calls "the human and terrestrial side of true piety." He distinguishes it from holiness, which includes virtue, as a part includes the whole. Virtue, on the contrary, does not include holiness, although in its higher and genuine sense it presupposes it, and is inseparable from it. The following passage forcibly states the absurdity of divorcing morality or virtue from its attendant piety:—

"When, then, cavillers ask, Why should not the Christian give up his doctrines and mysteries of Faith, and fall back content on the mere bare morals of the New Testament—it will be seen that the objection assumes to divide what God has not divided—to sever the man's immortality from his mortality, Eternity from Time, and Heaven from Earth, the throne of reckoning from the scene of probation, and the Sovereign Creator from His

creature and subject. It assumes to discharge a man from all his obligations to his native country, Heaven, and to his Father and Maker there, provided he will but defray his moral indebtedness, his debts of human duty in this foreign land of earth, where he stays but for the brief date of this present life, and which he must quit at death. It sets up a power in human society and earthly morality, to compound for man's hopeless insolvency before another tribunal, in a greater country and a mightier kingdom than Earth: whilst, at the same time, this earth remains necessarily and ever but a subject province and outlying colony of that greater, mightier kingdom. It teaches a man to take out, under the pettifogging legislation, and abridged and diluted morality of the world, an indemnity and release that is to discharge him from the claims of his Maker, and the retributions of Eternity. Is the attempt wise? Will the experiment be safe?"

But it is time for us to bring our article to a close. We have only given our readers a glimpse or two of the riches of this book. It is full of important lessons in practical godliness. It is rich in its illustration of the relations of piety to all the great problems and movements of society, to the manifold relations and duties of practical life. We believe it will be eminently useful in banishing the skepticism and the worldliness, which are too prevalent in the church, in instructing Christians in the great duties and glorious prerogatives of their profession, and stimulating them to higher attainments in godliness. The style may be less finished, and there may be greater marks of haste, than in the author's previous occasional productions; but it is such a work as only genius, learning, and piety, combined in an eminent degree, could produce. We earnestly commend it to the careful reading and study of every devout mind.

The discourses on the Lord's Prayer we hope to make the subject of a separate article. The importance and richness of the theme, and the ability with which it is handled, will justify a more extended notice of this work. It sustains the high reputation of its author, and few probably will rise from its perusal without a greatly enlarged view of the depth, and riches, and glory, of that wonderful prayer.

ART. VII.—ROBERT SOUTHEY.

BY REV. THOMAS CURTIS, D. D.,

LIMESTONE SPRINGS, S. C.

The Life and Correspondence of ROBERT SOUTHEY. Edited by his Son, the Rev. Charles Cuthbert Southey, M. A., Curate of Plumbland, Cumberland. New-York : Harper & Brothers. Pp. 579.

MR. SOUTHEY was "a man of mark,"* and has left an impression on the literature of his age—not arising from preëminent strength of mind, for many of his contemporaries and opponents were, in this respect, his superiors, (Coleridge, Byron, Hazlitt—perhaps; and perhaps William Cobbett;) nor from the early or educational culture of his mind—for here he had a host of more learned rivals. His well-earned distinction as a man of letters, was obtained in a way which made both his attainments and example more useful while he lived, and more instructive to posterity. It was the result of a diligent and honest use of powers of mind, and educational advantages not at all uncommon. And thus it largely gains in breadth of influence what it may be acknowledged to have lost in depth; or in that *circumscribed intensity*, with which more splendid and more favored sons of genius operate on their respective circles. If, as a poet, there was much in him, born, and not made, (*Poeta nascitur non fit*;) as a literary man, (taken in the whole,) there was far more in which *he was* made all he was, by application and perseverance; largely self-made, therefore. We are quite delighted with the manner in which he so often, throughout this correspondence, quotes the simple, household words of his Church Catechism, (resisting strong temptation to the contrary,) that he must remain "in that state of life unto which it had pleased God to call him." We love and applaud his prac-

* Thomson has happily characterized his position—(in no *Castle of Indolence*, certainly, though we there find the lines)—

Of all the gentle tenants of the place,
There was a man of special, grave remark;
A certain tender gloom o'erspread his face;
Pensive, not sad; in thought involved not dark.

tical decisions, on a singular variety of personal and public questions, which were forced upon him, far more than any of his theories, religious or moral. He was the personification of Foster's *decided* character, throughout all the affairs of life. Coleridge was the theorist, to utter impracticability and unintelligibility, as Southey was the man for doing, and speaking plainly—in everything to which he set his hand.

In a former number of this Review, we traced the joint path of these distinguished persons, to the point of their divergence from each other; and left Mr. Southey on a visit to Lisbon. Coleridge will now be only an occasional visitant of the sphere of his younger and more practical friend.

We do not know whether we have been more delighted or profited, more encouraged or warned, by the perusal of the *Life and Correspondence* before us. On the whole, we are put into that grave, good humor with the interesting subject of this biography, to which we unhesitatingly invite our readers. They should start with it, on the plan of catechising one's-self into good spirits, before a long journey—for this "*Life*" is one of protracted details; and because, in addition to the numerous smaller ills to which flesh is heir, and which Southey will make us feel as he presents them, the disappointment of well-laid plans thickens as we proceed, and closes with facts unusually melancholy.

In June, 1801, he returned to England, and after a short sojourn at Bristol, he becomes the guest of Mr. Coleridge, at Greta Hall, Keswick, a circumstance which decides his abode for the largest period of his life. Coleridge had suggested the idea of their joint occupation of this romantic spot some months before, and his brief, but graphic description of it, will make any future allusions to it, which may occur, intelligible. "Our house stands on a low hill, the whole front of which is one field; and an enormous garden, nine-tenths of which is a nursery garden. Behind the house is an orchard, and a small wood on a steep slope, at the foot of which flows the river Greta, which winds round and catches the evening lights in front of the house. In front, we have a giant's camp—an encamped army of tent-like mountains, which, by an inverted arch, gives a view of another vale. On our right, the lovely vale, and the wedge-shaped lake of Bassenthwaite; and on our left, Derwentwater and Lodore, full in view, and the fantastic mountains of Borrowdale. Behind us the massy Skiddaw, smooth, green, high, with two chasms and a tent-like ridge in the larger. A fairer scene you have not seen in all your wanderings. Without going from your own grounds, we have all that can please a human being."

Wordsworth lived within a day's ride.

Southey speaks of a sight which he enjoyed one sunny day, as more dreamy and more wonderful than any scenery of Fairy Land. "The opposite shore of Derwentwater consists of one long mountain, which suddenly terminates in an arch, thus —; and through that opening you see a long valley between mountains, and bounded by mountain beyond mountain; to the right of the arch the heights are more varied and of greater elevation. Now, as there was not a breath of air stirring, the surface of the lake was so perfectly still that it became one great mirror, and all its waters disappeared; the whole line of shore was represented as vividly and steadily as if it existed in actual being—the arch, the vale within, the single houses far within the vale, the smoke from their chimneys, the farthest hills, and the shadow and substance joined at their bases so indivisibly, that you could make no separation even in your judgment. As I stood on the shore, heaven and the clouds seemed lying under me. I was looking down into the sky, and the whole range of mountains having one line of summits under my feet, and another above me, seemed to be suspended between the firmaments. Shut your eyes and dream of a scene so unnatural and so beautiful. What I have said is most strictly and scrupulously true; but it was one of those happy moments that can seldom occur, for the least breath stirring would have shaken the whole vision, and at once unrealized it."

Southey's life was poetical, political, literary, and religious—and these aspects of it were presented in something like this order: He was poetical and political in early manhood; poetical and literary in his riper years; literary and religious in his slow decline.

Thalaba was now printed—having been sent home before him from Portugal; he obtained for it £115 clear the first year of its publication; and it was, he tells us, "just twelve months of intermitting work."

Madoc was his next poetical offspring. It appeared in 1805, having a much longer period of gestation, i. e., sixteen years. When it is nearly ready, he says, he shall "feel, on completing it, a sort of awfulness—as if one of the purposes of his existence would thus be accomplished." But it was never popular; the publishers, unfortunately, (and without his privity,) announced it as an "epic," and printed it in 4to., at a high price. We well remember the appearance of various dusty, unwelcome copies on the shelves of the London booksellers. Walter Scott admires "the *poetry*," or execution, but tacitly falls in with Southey's own maturer judgment, that the subject was not interesting, and tells our author, "that he must be content with the applause of the few whom nature has gifted

with the rare taste for discernment in poetry." It was on the whole, however, Mr. Southey's favorite poem. Posterity was to judge of him by its merits; "it must live," he is assured, and he challenges a comparison of it "with the *Odyssey*—not the *Iliad*; with King John or Coriolanus—not Macbeth, or the *Tempest*."

He was, at this time, compelled to sustain his economical establishment, by contributions to the *Monthly Magazine*, the *Reviews*, and the *Morning Post*; and was almost "tempted to sell his soul for three months to Stuart," (the editor of the last named,) "for thirteen guineas in advance." The liberality of his schoolmate, C. W. W. Wynn, Esq., who granted him a voluntary annuity of £160, for some years, was now, indeed, his only certain dependence.

Through the influence of this gentleman and Mr. Rickman, a clerk of the House of Commons, one or two political engagements were sought for him; which resulted in the offer of a private secretaryship to Mr. Corry, the Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was limited to one year, lest they should not suit each other, with a salary of £350; and the proviso was judicious; for within that period our author relinquished it. He describes Mr. Corry as of gentle and unassuming manners; and the place as almost a sinecure; or, as his own phrase is, "a foolish office with a good salary;" but the attendance and dependence were humiliating; and when the great man requested him to undertake the instruction of his son, as a part of his duty, Southey resigned. During his short stay in Ireland, his keen perception of character appears. "The government (Lord Hardwicke's) acting well and wisely, controls both parties—the Orangemen and United Irishmen—the old fatteners on corruption are silent in shame; the military, who must be kept up, will be employed on the public roads." "It will be difficult to civilize this people. An Irishman builds him a turf sty, gets his fuel from the bogs, digs his patch of potatoes, and then lives upon them in idleness; like a true savage, he does not think it worth while to work that he may better himself. Potatoes and buttermilk—on this they are born and bred; and whiskey sends them to the third heaven at once. If Davy had one of them in his laboratory, he could analyze his flesh, blood, and bones, into nothing but potatoes, and buttermilk, and whiskey." Our benevolent old acquaintance speaks of things, of course, as he found them; but this picture suggests a question of serious importance in other countries besides Ireland—How far the appetite for independence can be assumed in some races, before *you create it*, and who has the duty to create it?

He tells us the United Irishmen must have obtained at one time possession of Dublin, but for a *bull*. On the night appointed, the mail coach was to be stopped and burned, about a mile from the city, and *that* was the signal; the lamplighters were in the plot; when oh! to be sure! the honeys would not light a lamp in Dublin that evening, for fear the people should see what was going on! Of course, alarm was taken, and all this mischief prevented! "Genius," he says, "appears to characterize them—a love of saying good things, which nine hundred and ninety-nine Englishmen out of a thousand never dream of attempting." When Lord Hardwicke came over, there fell a fine rain, the first after a long season of dry weather. A servant of Dr. Lindsey's heard an Irishman call to his comrade in the street, "Ho, Pat! and we shall have a riot!"—of course, a phrase to quicken an Englishman's hearing—"this rain will breed a riot; the little potatoes will be pushing out the big ones."

Sir H. Davy had been an early friend of Southey's—"I am afraid," he writes at this time, "and it makes me melancholy when I think of it, that Davy will never be to me the being that he has been. These scientific men are indeed the victims of science; they sacrifice to it their own feelings, and virtues, and happiness." In another place he says, "I have little liking for men of science; their pursuits seem to deaden the imagination and harden the heart; they are so accustomed to analyze and anatomize everything—to understand, or fancy they understand, whatever comes before them, that they frequently become mere materialists; account for everything by mechanism and motion, and would put out of the world all that makes the world endurable. I do not undervalue their knowledge, nor the utility of their discoveries; but I do not like the men."

Sweet and honorable domestic feelings pervade his whole life, and are constantly intermingled with thoughts of a better world. On the death of his mother, (although he had not experienced much of her care in childhood,) he was deeply affected. "When I saw her after death," he writes to his friend Wynn, "the whole appearance was so much that of utter death, that the first feeling was as if there could have been no world for the dead. The feeling was very strong, and it required thought and reason to recover my former certainty, that as surely we must live hereafter, as all here is not the creation of folly and chance."

We meet with two or three graphic and generous touches here respecting contemporary authors. To Coleridge, whom he too well knew: "As to your essays, you spawn plans like a

herring: I only wish as many of the seed were to vivify in perfection! Your Essay on Contemporaries, I am not much afraid of the imprudence of, because I have no expectation that it will ever be written." Of Bloomfield, the author of *The Farmer's Boy*: "I saw Bloomfield in London, and an interesting man he is; even more than you would expect. I have reviewed his poems with the express object of serving him, because if his fame keeps up to another volume, he will have money enough to support him in the country; but in a work of criticism, how could you bring him to the touchstone? And to lessen his reputation is to mar his fortune." He speaks of Campbell slightly; of Mrs. Inchbald, as "an old woman, but I like her;" of Flaxman, "whose touch is better than his feeling;" and of Perkins, the Tractator, as "a demure-looking rogue." Of Wordsworth's *Lyrics*: "Does he not associate more feeling with particular phrases, (and you with him,) than those phrases convey to any one else? This I suspect. Who would part with a ring of a dead friend's hair? And yet a jeweller will give for it only the value of the gold: and so must words pass for their current value." "They" (the Edinburgh Reviewers) "are for the richness and ornament of Virgil; I am for the plainness of Homer. They want periwigs placed upon bald ideas."

But he is unfortunate in some of his predictions as to other writings as well as his own. "The Edinburgh Review will not keep its ground; it consists of pamphlets, instead of critical accounts." The fact being, that it elevated the whole art of reviewing, and, putting down trashy pamphleteering, and trashy criticism, nourished a Brougham, Jeffrey, Macaulay, and Scott, for the highest walks of literature and of life. He has just indignation at their light estimate of "the cost of a war." "There is the quantity of three whole pamphlets, in one article upon the balance of power; in which the *brimstone-fingered son of oatmeal* says, that wars are now carried on by the sacrifice of a few useless millions, and more useless lives (!) and by a few sailors fighting *harmlessly* upon the barren ocean."

Hayley's *Life of Cowper* he calls "the most pickpocket work, for its shape and price, and author and publisher, that has ever appeared." "Cowper was not a strong-minded man, even in his best moments. The very few opinions he gave upon authors are quite ridiculous. The Methodists, among whom he lived, made him ten times madder than he would else have been."

In the midst of his poverty, he could indulge the gratification of helping the still poorer. Both Coleridge and himself

had entertained a morbid compassion for Chatterton, whom Wordsworth called

“ The marvellous boy,
Whose sleepless soul had perished in its pride.”

And when Cottle (another Bristolian) represented that Mrs. Newton, Chatterton's sister, had been cajoled out of his MSS. by Sir H. Croft, Southey urged her claims upon him. Finding the baronet deaf to remonstrance, he published their correspondence; arranged with Cottle a new edition of Chatterton's works, and had the satisfaction of paying Mrs. N. a sum (£300) which rescued her and her daughter from want.

He speaks of Walter Scott, before the publication of his original works, as a man of great talent and genius; of the Scottish Border Ballads, as “a patchwork with new bricks.” “In all these modern ballads, there is a modernism of thought and language—turns, to me very perceptible and very unpleasant; the more so from its mixture with antique words—polished steel, and rusty iron.” Scott, he says, adopted the same system of versification with himself—“varying his tune, in the same stanza, from iambic to anapæstic *ad libitum*.”

It is gratifying to see our earlier poet hail the rising star of this more successful rival; at a later period there was a close intimacy between them.

One of the most important of his literary negotiations took place this year, with the house of Longman; never, however, to be acted upon. It will only exhibit the confidence reposed in him, in his 29th year, by competent judges. It was to undertake the management, (with “the full and absolute choice of all his associates, and the distribution of the whole work,”) of a Bibliotheca Britannica, on a very extensive scale—to be published in volumes of 800 pages, 4to., in parts. He nominated as his chief assistants, Sharon Turner, Mr. (afterwards Sir Anthony) Carlisle, Coleridge, Wm. Taylor, J. Rickman, Capt. Burney, Duppa, and a Mr. Owen. But the publishers afterwards requested delay, and this giving Mr. Southey the option of withdrawal, he engaged in more congenial pursuits.* The Correspondence includes an improvement on the original plan by Coleridge, which is well worth perusal, and which, with some modifications, was engrafted into the Encyclopædia Metropolitana. Southey writes of it, “Your plan is too good, too gigantic, quite beyond my powers. . . . No man can

* Life and Cor., p. 163.

better feel where he fails than I do; and to rely upon you for whole quartos! Dear Coleridge, the smile that comes with that thought is a melancholy one."

Here is a practical temperance anecdote. It is in a caution to his brother, now a lieutenant in the navy. "Adapt your mode of living to the climate you are going to, and abstain almost entirely from wine and spirits. Gen. Peache, an East India officer here, with whom we dined on Christmas day, told me that in India the officers who were looking out for preferment, as a majority do, and who kept lists of all above them, always marked those who drank any spirits in a morning with an X, and reckoned them for nothing. 'One day,' said he, 'when we were about to march at daybreak, I and Captain —— were in my tent, and we saw a German of our regiment; so I said, we'd try him. We called to him, said it was a cold morning, and asked him if he would drink a glass to warm him. I got him a full breaker of brandy and water, and, egad, he drank it off! When he was gone, I said, well, what d'ye think: we may cross him, mayn't we?' 'Oh, yes,' said he, 'cross him by all means.' And the German did not live twelve months.'"

He is now engaged for some years on Aiken's Annual Register, and learns that his articles on Malthus and the Methodists have contributed much to its reputation. He hates Malthus' theory, and laughs with a friend at "the impudence" of the man, in marrying after publishing it. In 1805 he is again asked, by a ministerial friend, what situation under the government he felt equal to undertaking: but his opinions only are accepted, and he returns to his literary labor.

He gives his views, at this time, on a subject which he calls "*The great political question*,"—a Catholic Establishment in Ireland. This he thinks the only means of civilizing that country. "A petition that asked for this, saying plainly, 'We are papists, and will be so, and this is the best thing that can be done for us, and for you too,' I would support," he says, "on the strange ground that Jesuits and Benedictines, though they would *not* enlighten the savages, would humanize them, and bring them into civilization." "As to the English Protestant Dissenters," he adds, "they will die away! Destroy the Test Act, and you will kill them!" He lived to alter his opinion materially on both points. The latter we are disposed to rank with the "unmitigated nonsense," which his son states as a favorite occasional recreation of his—"he shared in common with many wise men."

That his political, indeed all his leading opinions, underwent extraordinary changes, he never affected to conceal. At the

beginning of the second war with France, in 1802, he commenced an ode, (which he never finished,) containing this apology for his "somersaults:"

"O dear, dear England, O, my mother isle,
There was a time when, woe the while,
In thy proud triumphs I could take no part;
And even the tale of thy defeat,
In those unhappy days was doomed to meet
Unnatural welcome in an English heart:
For thou wert leagued in an accursed cause,
O dear, dear England! and thy holiest laws
Were trampled under foot by insolent power.
Dear as my own heart's blood wert thou to me,
But even thou less dear than liberty."

In this same year (1805) he first meets, in Scotland, his great poetical rival, Walter Scott, and his critical enemies, the Edinburgh Reviewers. Scott and he were very cordial; but it is amusing to smaller men to see Greek meet Greek in literature. 1. There was the effort of mutual friends to conciliate. Mr. Scott was the friendly herald to prepare the lists for the expected tilting. 2. A Mr. Thompson, at whose rooms they were to meet, (a friend of poor Burns'), was commissioned to hand to Southey the unpublished sheets of an article in the Edinburgh Review, on "Madoc." This he calls "a sort of gentlemanly decency," and it induces him, 3. To resolve, as the Review was adverse, "very unfair, and very uncivil," he says, to meet Jeffrey "with perfect courtesy, just giving him to understand that I have as little respect for his opinions as he for mine; thank him for sending me the sheets, and then turn to other subjects." The interview was unimportant. Our author thought his own circle of literary friends, Landor, William Taylor, Coleridge, &c., far before this lauded group in mental calibre. "As the Review said I was opposed to Pope, I told him (Jeffrey) that Pope was a model for satire. 'That,' he said, 'was a great concession.' No, said I, if his style be a model for satire, how can it be for serious narrative?" Afterwards he writes to his friend, Bedford, "There is not in the whole 9,000 lines of this poem, one sin as to unwarrantable liberties in language. So very laboriously was Madoc corrected, time after time, that I will pledge myself, if you ask me in any instance why one word stands in the place of another, which you may perhaps think the better one, to give you a reason which will convince you, that I had previously weighed both in the balance."

His History of Portugal was the study and pride of our author's life. At the age of 31, he says, "It was an act of for-

bearance to keep back what had cost him so much labor." "It will be a good book, which sooner or later will justify me in having chosen literature for my life-pursuit." In this he had "a sure and certain faith." But the field of this labor was ill-chosen. Who, even in Europe, was ever deeply interested in Portugal but Mr. Southey? Except the heavy episode of the History of Brazil, he, living in full vigor, over thirty years from this, was never encouraged to give these labors to the public. He is always more correct as a poet than as a prophet. In 1806, he says, "My reviewing is this day finished for ever and ever, amen! I am weary of it. Seven years have I been preying upon rats and mice, and such small deer; and for the future will fly at better game." Yet he *is* a reviewer, the chief stay of the London Quarterly, and on the point of becoming its editor many years after!

The lines now first published, on the death of a rich uncle, who left him nothing, are amusing, if in taste and feeling little to our taste:

"Lo, thou art gone at last, old John,
And hast left all from me;
God give thee rest among the bless'd—
I lay no blame to thee.
* * * * *
But a hopeless sorrow it strikes to the heart,
To think how men like thee depart.
Unloving and joyless was thy life,
Unlamented was thy end;
And neither in this world nor the next,
Hadst thou a single friend.
None to weep for thee on earth,
None to greet thee in heaven's hall;
Father and mother, sister and brother,
Thy heart had been shut to them all.
Alas, old man, that this should be!
One brother had raised up seed to thee;
And hadst thou in their hour of need,
Cherished that dead brother's seed,
Thrown wide thy doors and called them in,
How happy thine old age had been!
Thou wert a barren tree, around whose trunk,
Needing support, our tendrils should have clung;
Then had thy sapless boughs,
With buds of hope and genial fruit been hung;
Yea, with undying flowers,
And wreaths forever young."

He now commences his *Chronicle of the Cid*, which he describes to Scott as the most ancient and most curious piece of chivalry history in existence; and despondingly proceeds with the *Curse of Kehama*. In 1808, he edits the popular *Remains*

of Kirke White; and here occur a few words as to his religious views. He had to furnish a preface. "My own religious sentiments are not less zealous and not less sincere," he writes to the family, "but they are totally opposite to his." And afterwards to Mr. Duppa, "I have stated [this] in the shortest and most decorous manner." "Still that I should become, and that voluntarily, an Editor of Methodistical and Calvinistic letters, is a thing which, when I think of, excites the same sort of smile that the thought of my *pension* does; and I wonder, like the sailor, what is to be done next." His friend, Mr. Wynn, then Under Secretary of State, had obtained for him this year a pension of £200 from the British Government.

His final views respecting the Catholics have proved singularly correct. He was for abolishing all tests with regard to other sects, Jews and all; but not as to the Catholics. "*They will not tolerate,*" he says—"Their religion regards no national distinctions; it teaches them to look at Christendom and the Pope at its head; and the interest of that religion will always be preferred to everything." Again: "It is the nature of their principles *now* to spread in this country: Methodism and the still wilder sects preparing the way for it. You have no conception of the zeal with which they seek for proselytes, nor the power they have over weak minds; for their system is as well the greatest work of human wisdom, as it is of human wickedness. It is curious that the Jesuits exist in England as a body, and have possessions here. Having been abolished by the Pope, they keep up their order secretly, and expect their restoration; which, if he be wise, Bonaparte will effect. Were I a Catholic, that should be the object to which my life should be devoted—I would be the second Loyola! Concessions and conciliations will not satisfy the Catholics; vengeance and the throne are what they want."

He frequently repeats these sentiments, and vigilantly watches the Catholic movements. A year or two after, he finds their old establishment at Douay (in France) removed to Ushaw, near Durham. It began here with an expenditure of £2,000, and soon gathered one hundred students.

We cannot particularize the various publications and abortive schemes of our author and his publishers; but it is curious to see the Edinburgh Review opened to him, as a contributor, within a year of his visit to Scotland. In declining the offer, made through Scott, he asserts an honorable independence of mind. "Setting aside personal feelings and the reviews of Thalaba and Madoc," he has scarcely "one opinion in common" with the Reviewers. They were for peace, and were endeavoring to frighten the people into it—he "for war,

so long as Bonaparte lived!" They advocated Catholic Emancipation: he opposed it, and believed its first effect would be "to introduce an Irish priest into every ship of the navy." Nor were his moral feelings more in unison with them than his opinions. "To Jeffrey," he finally says, "as an individual, I shall ever be ready to show individual courtesy; but of Judge Jeffrey, of the *Edinburgh Review*, I must ever think and speak as a bad politician, a worse moralist, and a critic, in matters of taste, equally incompetent and unjust."

In 1808, he first meets with Savage Landor, and describes him as a man altogether unlike himself in every prominent point of character; yet, who "cordially and instinctively agreed with" him "on the most important subjects." There is something curious in this view of the most important subjects that do not form the most prominent points of character—but we must not play the minute critic. Landor, a man of fortune, at once tells him to go on with his mythological and other poems, which he had laid aside; he would print and pay for as many as Southey would write; and this 'stimulates' him to resume the *Curse of Kehama*.

He is sanguine as to the issue of the Peninsular war. At its commencement, he would have had Spain and Portugal formed into "one Federal Republic!"—thinks "there is more public virtue in Spain than in any other country under heaven; that religion has done much for Spain;"* and that "there is not in history such an instance" as now took place "of national regeneration." He writes a needless *oath*, that she would assuredly "work out her own redemption." Alas! that she has had so little perseverance! His own country, in 1809, is "certainly approaching a revolution!" He prides himself, however, with justice, in more truly foreseeing the immediate consequences of the Spanish outbreak than the *Edinburgh Reviewers*, who insisted that Spain would be wholly conquered by Napoleon.

The publication of the *Quarterly Review* exercised a great influence on our author's life. The idea originated with Scott, who professed, with the Tory party of the day, to be disgusted at the cowardly and unpatriotic spirit of the *Edinburgh*; engaged Mr. Gifford as the Editor; Southey, Davy, and a host of able contributors—none of whom set to work with greater zeal than Mr. S. He "would stake his head," he said, at that time, "on the final overthrow of Bonaparte." But he distinguishes himself from what he calls the "High-orthodox-men, both of Church and State." "They will always think as they

* *Life and Cor.*, p. 241.

are told: there is no policy in writing for them; the Anti-Jacobin and British Critic are good enough for their faces of brass, brains of lead, and tongues of bell-metal." This feeling brought him occasionally into conflict with Gifford, who would omit or interpolate, editorially, what he pleased. But Southey jogs along with him until Gifford's death.

His finances were now much improved. In stating them confidentially to Mr. Scott, who said that Mr. Canning wished to serve him—the Keswick poet admits us behind both Whig and Tory scenes. Charles Wynn, when in power, had asked Mr. Fox to send Southey to Portugal. "John Allen wanted something which was in Lord Grenville's gift, and this was given him, on condition that Fox should provide for Southey." A consulship and the secretaryship of legation fell vacant. The former was twice given away, Mr. Fox saying it was too good for S. "The latter he *promised*, if an opportunity occurred of promoting Lord Strangford, but that never took place." Soon after, he writes, "I have discharged a little of my gall upon the Foxites, the place-mongers, and Mr. Whitbread"—in the Edinburgh Annual Register. "This is a very profitable engagement. They give me £400 a-year for it; and if it continue two or three years, it will leave me altogether at ease."

In 1811, the Whigs, or Mr. Whitbread individually, wished to prosecute the Edinburgh Annual Register for some of its cutting remarks on the Spanish questions; and to reprimand Southey, it seems, at the bar of the House of Commons. He chuckles at the manner in which he should have received this.

On the rise of the Bible Society, our author displays an ingenuity *versus* ingenuousness, quite of the Loyola school. He thinks that Bishop Marsh, whose motto was, "The prayer-book and the Bible," (the former to act as a "safeguard" to the latter,*) was in argument right. But "he was very injudicious

* The High-Church party of England have not always thought the Prayer-book to be a sufficient "safeguard," however. It is too Calvinistic. The following fact in the history of "The Church" may be taken in proof:—During a memorable controversy respecting the true interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, Mr. Overton, author of "The True Churchman Ascertained," had quoted freely these standard documents in proof of the Calvinism of the Church. A leader on the Arminian side was, at that time, a Syndic of one of the University presses—a Dean too, holding a high office in the University; and a new edition of the Prayer-book was passing through the press. (The Universities have, with the Queen's printers, the entire monopoly in England of printing Prayer-books and Bibles.) The proof sheets were before him. With an exclamation something like, "Away with these articles, *they* shall not be quoted against us in this edition," *he struck them out of that edition!* This the writer was told by a successor of the Dean's in office, who is now one of the highest dignitaries of the Church, and the party in whose presence the exclamation was made.

in exciting the controversy, because upon that statement of the case which his opponents will make, and which appears at first sight to be a perfectly fair one, *everybody must* conclude him to be in the wrong—and very few will look further." "His object might have been effected by a little management." That is, the case of the Church-opponents of the Society was so obscure, that "everybody" must believe said Society right, *prima facie*, and "very few" persons could be found in all England wise or interested enough for the Church, to look into her case, and prove it right! What concessions lurk here!

Mr. Cuthbert Southey regards the year 1813, and a few following ones, as the busiest and happiest part of his father's life. He was contentedly devoted to literature: he published his most popular work, the *Life of Nelson*, and *Roderick*, the last of the Goths; interested himself in the state of the poor, and particularly in their education; "sold only about half his time to the periodicals," devoting the other half to poetry and history; and became, by the handsome declination of Walter Scott, Poet Laureate.

A little prior to this, he describes to a correspondent his rule of writing: "My style has no other peculiarity than that of being pure English, which unhappily, at this time, renders it peculiar. My rule of writing, whether for prose or verse, is the same, and may very shortly be stated: It is, to express myself—1st, as perspicuously as possible; 2d, as concisely as possible; 3d, as impressively as possible."

At Lord Holland's he meets, at this period, with Byron, Mackintosh, and Rogers. Lord Byron's account is, "Yesterday, at Holland House, I was introduced to Southey. To have that poet's head and shoulders, I would almost have written his sapphics. He is certainly a prepossessing-looking person; a man of talent, and all that—*there* is his eulogy."*

The net income of his Laureate was but £90; the honor little, and his connection with the Court irksome.

This office led to his quarrel with Lord Byron. On the death of Geo. III., the Poet Laureate published a *Vision of Judgment*, in hexameters—altogether one of his weakest and most unhappy appearances as an author—with a preface, containing very caustic remarks on the publication of "lascivious books." If the occasion was not well chosen, the castigation was well deserved. It spoke of "the great talents of the offender," in such a case, as "involving the greater guilt;" and of "men of diseased hearts and depraved imaginations, forming a system

* *Life of Byron*, vol. ii, p., 244.

of opinions to suit their own unhappy conduct;" and having "set up what might be properly called the Satanic School." Everybody saw the allusion to some of the then current writings of Byron and Shelley. Of the former, the *Edinburgh Review* said, they had "a tendency to destroy all belief in the reality of virtue—by the constant exhibition of the most profligate heartlessness—in union with the expression of the loftiest conceptions."* Yet Mr. Jeffrey attributed Southey's remarks to envy; and evidently alludes to him in saying, "He (Lord Byron) has no priest-like cant or priest-like reviling to apprehend from *us*; we do not charge him with being either a disciple or an apostle of Satan." In no case does the Northern autocrat of literature appear to us to have acted with so much injustice to a public writer as in this treatment of our poet. If his own accusations of Lord Byron could be sustained, (and they were, in truth, more personal than Southey's, for the *Review* names his lordship, which Southey does not,) then Southey was to be applauded, and not condemned, for the boldness of his attack.

But Byron was furious. Mr. Southey's poem, he said, was "blasphemous"—(it contained some foolish praises of the deceased king, and took some strange liberties with "the judgments" of heaven)—his conduct was that of a man of "cowardly ferocity," &c. When Mr. S. vindicated himself in a letter to the *Courier*, Lord Byron immediately forwarded, through a friend, a challenge to fight him on the Continent, but that friend wisely suppressed it.

The above was connected with another difficulty of our author's. In the House of Commons, not long before this, the member for Norwich, Mr. W. Smith, had commented severely on Southey's political changes. He produced in the House a copy of *Wat Tyler*, a poem which, written in his minority, had been recently published without the Poet Laureate's consent; and read in contrast with it a passage from the *Quarterly Review*, (also attributed to Mr. Southey,) which strongly condemned the principles of the poem.

Southey writes and publishes on this occasion a very bitter "letter" to Mr. Smith. Neither the city nor the senatorial publishers of his poem are spared. Equally warm as with Lord Byron, he is not so successful in his own defence. The facts of the case should have moderated his temper: *Wat Tyler* was his production; bearing marks of great maturity of mind—involving, therefore, proportionable responsibility. It was in the estimation of many a better poem than the *Vision of Judgment*.

* *Edin. Review*, No. 72.

When he wrote and *offered* it for publication, (according to his own calm estimate of its character,) he was a dangerous young man, and committed an offence against his country. For this he should, on every review of that period, have borne his faculties meekly. It might be a hard lesson to learn, but it was the fitting one; and a just plea for abatement of his wrath against Mr. Smith. We advert to it entirely as a warning to other gifted and rash young writers, who may never be able to extricate themselves from an early *printed* offence of this kind. No "adversary" could have "written a book" which at this time would have been equally mortifying to our author.

The publishers of *Wat Tyler* had a more obvious defence. He gave away the original copy; they found it floating abroad in the world, and sought a tradesman's profit from it. It would have been generous and honorable, but it does not seem a matter of *right*, that they should have given it up, or back again to him. Mr. Southey had no right whatever, we think, to attribute "base" motives to them.

We have thus possessed our readers of the main facts of this interesting "Life." Mr. S. continued to reside at Keswick, but traveled annually at home or abroad, and very successfully sustained his high reputation as an author to his 67th year. In 1820, he received at Oxford the honorary degree of D. C. L., and might have obtained, at different periods, the Editorship of the *Times* newspaper, and of the *Quarterly Review*. He was elected, by the influence of Lord Radnor, to a seat in parliament, which he promptly decided to vacate, as not pecuniarily, nor, as he conceived, practically qualified for it. Sir Robert Peel, by the direction of Geo. IV., proffered him a baronetcy, which he also declined, on pecuniary grounds entirely; upon which the noble Premier tendered him an increase of a clear £300 to his former pension. He thus slowly accumulated a considerable property. Gladly should we have followed him more particularly into other events of his brighter days, but our space forbids. We have noticed at considerable length his *Life of Wesley*, in a former paper.

In his family he had great blessings and great trials. Of six children, four survived him—three daughters, and the clerical editor of this work. The last days of his first marriage were beclouded by the insanity of Mrs. Southey for three years; and his own last days by a total mental decay—scarcely affording "the glimmerings of reason," for about the same length of time. Shortly before this unhappy season, he was united in marriage to Miss Bowles, the daughter of his old friend, Rev. L. Bowles.

We have no space for criticism on Mr. Southey's poetry.

Scott said, as a salvo to his faint praise of our author's *chef d'œuvre*, Madoc, that it would ("biding its time") "take its place at the feet of Milton." We are afraid that, could the half-inspired old Puritan be consulted, he would not allow it a near place there. Southey will rank respectably with the pleasing, but never with the first-rate poets of our language. Like Sir Walter, he did wisely in retiring at an early period into his far better *prose*; in which no English writer, perhaps, has excelled him since Addison. As a letter-writer, he has not been surpassed. Respecting his politics, we have a few words to quote presently from a more consistent and distinguished politician.

What, on the whole, does this "Life and Correspondence" enable us to decide as to his religion? That through the best years of his life, Mr. Southey was the able advocate of the mild form of Protestantism established by the law of England, with all its adjuncts of a splendid Episcopacy, a learned, if proud priesthood; two well-endowed executive Universities; and a long train of public and private patronage, furnishing the rewards of much occasional piety, and the temptations to much hypocrisy. He was the able *advocate* of the Episcopal Church of England: to what degree he was a full convert to its faith, is doubtful. The nature of his objections does not transpire; but on various occasions, and to a late period, he declares that he could not "subscribe" the Articles. Very little of religious doctrine appears in his writings; nothing of a positive nature that is specific. He was not a Roman Catholic; not a Methodist; had a perfect horror of Calvinism, *en masse*; and was completely delivered, we do not doubt, from the speculative unbelief of his early days. On none of his works did he bestow more pains, or reflect with more complacency, than on his "Book of the Church."* Yet this phrase meant the Church of England for the last thousand years, not the Protestant Church only of the last three hundred. It meant the Church of England, as the Thames means

* We have a strange account of his materials, "Life," p. 279: "I am well stored with materials—having all the re-published Chronicles, and Hooker, the *only* controversial work which it will be at all necessary to consult!" [Not Neale, not Clarendon, not Calderwood, nor any Church History of Scotland?] "The other books which I want I have ordered: they are, Burnet, the Church Histories of Fuller, and of the stiff old Nonjuror, Jeremy Collier." Mr. S. was miserably misled by these one-sided authorities, as to the state of the Church at the close of James the First's reign. Contemporary writers speak of the "notorious debauchery of the Episcopal clergy." The Court was extremely licentious; and Dean White, of the Established Church, testifies of "the torrent of profanity of all kinds being so strong, that it seems manifestly to tend to the dissolution of society."—*Vaughan's History of England*, v. 1. 194. London.

the Thames, or the Tower the Tower, of London, during all the last ten centuries; whatever has been the flux and reflux, the purity and pollution of the waters of the one, or the character and uses, as a palace or a prison, of the dark walls of the other.

He speaks and writes much of religion; but it is the religion of "our Church" always, rather than of our Saviour. His religion was very prominently and very certainly, an ecclesiastical one; not so certainly and prominently as we could have desired, a personal one. Christianity, at the best, is its *chief* corner-stone, not Christ. From a man who had been once altogether skeptical, at least, then Unitarian, and who retained long after among his chosen friends a gross unbeliever, (an avowed platonist,) William Taylor, of Norwich, we have especially desiderated some plainer confession of HIM who claims to be confessed wherever He is believed and relied upon. Coleridge here (or on some similar points of his history) was explicit, and proportionably honored with the hatred of some of his old friends.

Let us do justice to this most interesting case. Nay—more. In our heart of hearts we cherish Southey's memory, and love him for much that he did in the service of the faith. The charity that "hopeth all things," has some fine materials and moving-points for the belief that he was a Christian. In his sorrows he turns continually to religion, and speaks of its consolations as those which alone are worth anything at such seasons, and which in those seasons he had found. He looks confidently to an union hereafter with those he had loved on earth; and seems often more than willing to leave all things here below for it; but he fills heaven, like too many undoubtedly pious people, with Christians, rather than with Christ. There is no allusion, in a remarkable number of letters where this subject is mentioned, to *That* supreme attraction, and absorbing delight, of the New Testament heaven. Not a word about interest in Him, or "looking unto," or for Him, there. It is a chilling defect that every warm-hearted Christian reader must feel.

Mr. Wilberforce has a general sketch of his character, to which we entirely subscribe: "He is kind, hospitable, generous, virtuous, and, I hope, religious; but too hasty in his judgments, and too rash in his politics. Hence, he would be a dangerous counsellor, but an able defender."*

* Life of Wilberforce, by his sons, abridged, 12mo., p. 437, (Phil.)

This last excellent and illustrious layman, of whom Southey himself said, "If ever there was a good and happy man on earth, he was one," suggests a further practical thought that is relevant here. He accounts, somewhere in his writings, for the sad catastrophe of suicide occurring with several public men in his time, on a very memorable principle. In the great wear and tear of their minds, he says, (in effect,) they wanted the *relief* of Sabbaths spent with God! Now, where and how did Mr. Southey spend his? For years of his early life, avowedly avoiding every place of worship. We sincerely and confidently hope better things of his better days. But here again is a painful *hiatus* of testimony. In all his confidential correspondence, there is no trace of these things. "The condition of the Church at James the First's death," he says, in his "Book of the Church," was, to all outward appearance, as flourishing as its truest friends could have desired;" and he vindicates that pedantic and profligate bigot, (with Charles I., and with Laud,) for patronizing the Book of Sports, which prescribed the desecration of the Sabbath. His recorded notions of its character are decidedly loose and unscriptural. "To take Moses for our law-giver" here, is puritanical—is illy "to understand the spirit of the gospel," and "to be ignorant that the Sabbath was intended to be *not less* a day of recreation than of rest."* We cannot forbear conjecturing a *connection* between the early destruction of his mind, and this apparent defect in his religious habits. We believe the Sabbath, consistently observed, to have preserved the sanity, as it assuredly has renewed the vigor, of thousands of such minds; its sweet alternations of spiritual labor and repose, of public and private duties and privileges, of calm reflection and seraphic joy.

On the whole, as to religion, Mr. Southey was a Protestant Erasmus, or Sir Thos. More. He "attained not" at all to the rank of the Reformers, either of the 16th or the 18th century—good John Wesley was too hard a study for him—Whitefield utterly incomprehensible by him. Had he lived and ruled in the days of the earlier worthies, we should have had no Protestant Reformation. He would have spared the vices of the monks in admiration of their learning; and the monasteries with the cathedrals, as a question of good taste. Bitterly does he in terms lament the desecration of the idolatrous "altars" of Rome, (in the Common Prayer Book and Parish Churches,) into plain sacramental tables. He often has reminded us of a

* Book of the Church, vol. ii., p. 350, (Am. ed.)

letter of Luther's to Erasmus. It was the temper of a great body of good men toward Southey during half of his days. "You have not received from the Lord the courage requisite for marching side by side with us against the papists. We bear with your weakness. Do not desert the post assigned you, to take up your quarters in our camp. No doubt your eloquence and genius might be useful to us; but since your courage fails you, remain where you are. If I could have my will, those who are acting with me should leave your old age in peace, to fall asleep in the Lord. The greatness of our cause has long ago surpassed your strength. But then, dear Erasmus, cease, I pray you, to scatter with open hands the biting satire you are so skilled to clothe in flowery rhetoric. Only abstain from writing against us, and we will not attack you."*

Rich and worthy and amiable Southey, in mind, in morals, and in every kind temper of the heart, poor wert thou, and unsound, and of deplorably bitter prejudices, upon many of those high topics on which thou didst imagine thyself rich and gifted to guide! We reciprocate thy hopes of a heavenly reunion among all the comparatively just and good; but would cherish and teach, while remaining in such a world as this, a yet more consoling hope in the Just and Good beyond compare!

Wordsworth's Epitaph on Mr. Southey will aptly close our paper:

"Ye vales and hills, whose beauty hither drew
The poet's steps, and fixed him here; on you
His eyes have closed: and ye loved books, no more
Shall Southey feed upon your precious lore.
To works that ne'er shall forfeit their renown,
Adding immortal labors of his own—
Whether he traced historic truth with zeal
For the State's guidance, or the Church's weal,
Or fancy, disciplined by curious art,
Informed his pen, or wisdom of the heart,
Or judgment sanctioned in the patriot's mind,
By reverence for the rights of all mankind.
Wide were his aims, yet in no human breast
Could private feelings meet in holier rest.
His joys—his griefs—have vanished like a cloud,
From Skiddaw's top; but he to heaven was vowed
Through a life long and pure; and steadfast faith
Calm'd in his soul the fear of change and death."

* Luth. Epp. ii., 504.

ART. VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Tusculan Disputations, Book the First; the Dream of Scipio; and Extracts from the Dialogues on Old Age and Friendship. With English Notes.
By THOMAS CHASE, Tutor in Harvard College, Cambridge. Published by JOHN BARTLETT, Bookseller to the University. 1851. 18mo. Pp. 207.

A good American edition of Cicero's writings on the Immortality of the Soul is a welcome accession to our aid for the study of Latin literature, and of the writer, who more than any one else illustrated and enriched it. These writings, embodying, as they do, the views entertained by one of the most gifted minds of antiquity on the state of the soul after death, and showing better than modern works can do the real force of the natural evidences for the soul's immortality, cannot but awaken the liveliest interest in every thoughtful mind. They are not the original speculations of a professed philosopher, for such speculations were incompatible with the bent of Cicero's mind, with his whole character, and with his cherished habits and pursuits; they are rather the results of a wide and diligent study of philosophy, pursued by a great orator and statesman in the brief but precious intervals of a life of incessant and engrossing business, and always with the direct practical purpose of promoting his own intellectual and moral culture, and of fitting himself the better for the offices of public life. It is a singular fact, and illustrative of Cicero's native strength of intellect, and of his well disciplined and studious habits, that he composed nearly all his philosophical works at times and circumstances least friendly to the calm, meditative frame of mind which the composition of such works requires; when he was either pressed with the importunate demands of crowded professional occupation, or involved in the stormy commotions of the most revolutionary period of the Roman Republic, or when he was vexed with disappointment at his political reverses, or depressed with apprehensions for his personal safety and for the welfare of his country. The *De Officiis*, the *Cato Major*, and the *Laelius*, the *Academica* and the *Tusculan Disputations*, were all written and published either in, or immediately before, or after the year 44 B. C., when the Roman state was torn asunder by the assassination of Julius Cæsar, or disturbed by the factions and intrigues which preceded, or the confusion and strife which followed that memorable event. The *Tusculan Disputations* appeared early in that ill-fated year, and received their name from Cicero's villa at Tusculum, where they are represented as having been held, and where they were probably composed. In that chosen retreat, from which he had the great city in full view, and might almost hear the stir of its busy and tumultuous life, Cicero could shut out from his mind his public and private cares, and give himself to the study of Plato, and to the reflections it awakened on that great question, so full of interest to all earnest souls, alike in all ages and all climes, "If a man die, shall he live again?" In the first of these disputations, Cicero aims to show that death is not only not an evil, but even a blessing, and, to reach his end, he adduces and illustrates the various arguments, historical and metaphysical, for the soul's immortality. He argues the doctrine from the belief in it which is

innate in the soul itself, as shown by the authority of the most ancient nations, and the consent of nations at all times, and from the instinctive conviction and presentiment of a future life entertained by all, and especially by the greatest and loftiest minds. It is argued, too, *a priori*, from the nature of the soul, its original vitality, its boundless capacities, and its simplicity and indivisibility. All these arguments are put with clearness and force, variously illustrated from poetry and biography, and adorned with a rich and elegant diction, so that they attract and charm the reader, while they take a vigorous hold of his understanding. We are glad that Mr. Chase has incorporated in his edition that charming and elevated composition, the *Somnium Scipionis*, as well as those eloquent passages in the *Laelius* and the *Cato Major*, which bear upon the doctrine of the future life. These last are all the more interesting and instructive, as they are incidental and not argumentative, and are the spontaneous utterances of a faith, which had its origin in no courses of reasoning, but in the intuitions of the human soul. Scarcely anything in ancient literature is more intensely interesting than that eloquent and well nigh Christian passage at the close of the treatise on Old Age, where the venerable Cato contemplates with joy his departure from life as from a place of sojourn, and not from a home; and exults in the prospect of that "glorious day, when he shall quit this confusion and turmoil, and go to that divine council of the souls" of the great and the good of former times. Here we see the free outgoings of a faith in immortality, which is far deeper in its origin than any historical or metaphysical reasoning, and has its basis in the very depths of the moral nature of man.

But we have been insensibly drawn away from the present edition of these writings by their own intrinsic interest. We have read with great satisfaction the introduction to the book, which is a just vindication of the reality and strength of Cicero's faith in the soul's immortality. The text and the notes seem also to have been prepared with intelligence and diligence, with a legitimate use of the best authorities, and with a practical eye to the wants of students. The editor's studious effort to illustrate peculiarities of construction, and especially the nice and difficult doctrine of the subjunctive mood, is worthy of all commendation. It is not an easy matter to hit the just medium in such notes between the too much and the too little; and the editor, it seems to us, has sometimes erred on the one extreme, and sometimes on the other. Examples of the former are not unfrequently found in quotations of parallel passages in other writers, or from modern literary works, or from grammars and other works of reference; as for instance, on pp. 112, 127, 130, 131, 139, 140, 115, 187, 188, 189, 193, 201, 202. We do not see the propriety of quoting from Madvig's Grammar, when the requisite instruction could be found in the ordinary grammars; for instance, instead of the note at the top of p. 103, it would have been quite enough to refer the student to Andrews and Stoddard, § 266. The same may be said of the note on *iste*, p. 129, instead of which might as well stand simply Z. § 701. It is also hardly necessary to quote from Zumpt at all, as e. g. on p. 156, and p. 164, where a simple reference is all that the student needs. We miss now and then a note on a passage that seems to need explanation: e. g. on *quod contra*, etc., p. 91; and just below, a word on the subjunctive in *non quo ferrem* would have been pertinent. We miss also notes pointing out and illustrating the course of thought, especially in the Tusculan Disputations, where a brief enumeration and analysis of the several arguments, and an indication of the transitions from one to another, would have contributed to give method to the study of the book. We call attention to these little points, from no disposition to find fault, but rather from a sincere desire to make yet more useful

a good text book. In conclusion, we may remark, that the paper, type and printing of the book are excellent; as to the latter, we have noticed only a misprint of *proprius* twice in the same line on p. 201, for *propius*.

The Captains of the Old World; as compared with the great Modern Strategists, their Campaigns, Characters and Conduct; from the Persian to the Punic Wars. By HENRY WILLIAM HERBERT. New-York: Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau-street. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 364.

Mr. Herbert is favorably known to the literary public by his writings in periodical journals, and particularly, as a classical scholar, by his tale, entitled the Roman Traitor, and by his successful translation of the Prometheus and Agamemnon of Æschylus. In this new work he has made available to general readers, as well as to scholars and young students, the results of extensive and thorough researches in ancient history, communicated in an attractive and popular form. It has been his object to bring home to the intelligent and vivid comprehension of the modern reader, the great movements of the nations of antiquity, as they were originated and controlled by military genius and the exercise of the military art. To attain this end, he has portrayed the lives and deeds of those ancient generals who by the originating of new principles of military tactics, and by the decisive battles which they planned and conducted, deserve to be called, *par excellence*, the Captains of antiquity; and he has aimed so to exhibit their exploits by means of accurate descriptions of dress, equipments and modes of warfare, and by a constant comparison with similar events and their details in the history of the greatest generals of modern times, as to invest them with life and reality. The introductory chapter of the work contains a full account of all the details of military art among the Greeks and the Romans; and the subjects of the successive chapters are Miltiades, Themistocles, (we must be allowed to give the names in their received English, and not as the author does, in imitation of Grote in the Greek form,) Pausanias the Spartan, Xenophon the Athenian, Epaminondas the Theban, Alexander of Macedon, and Hannibal. We are glad to see in the life-like portraiture of the great Carthaginian, that Mr. Herbert is a diligent student and admirer of Arnold, and follows his authority and illustrates his method, though indeed without any disparagement of his own claims to real originality. The descriptions are eminently fresh and graphic; the style is generally lively, forcible and racy, frequently in admirable keeping with the rapid movements of the narrative, and always indicative of earnestness and thorough interest in the subject. With all these excellences, the literary character of the work is marred by marks of haste and want of finish; seeming to show, that though the author "wrote with fury," he did not always "correct with phlegm." The book is at once embellished and made more useful by vignettes illustrating such points as the Halt of Roman Knights, the Charge of the Roman Legion, March of a Greek Army, and Onset of Numidian Horse.

Florence, the Parish Orphan; and a Sketch of the Village in the last Century. By ELIZA BUCKMINSTER LEE, author of "Naomi." Boston: Ticknor, Reed & Fields. 1852. 18mo. Pp. 176.

A most delightful little book. Interesting in its subjects and scenes, skilful and true in its delineations of character, humane and good in its moral

and religious tone, and written with a beauty and felicity of language that wins the reader at once, and gains upon him to the last page. The fine paper, too, of the book, the clear type and the generous margin, and the binding that makes it open like a charm, are all in keeping with its inner character. The book consists of two parts; of which the first is the story of a parish orphan, a sad story, but beautifully told, the scene of which is laid in early New-England life, and whose moral is the effect of unrepressed passions in perverting an otherwise noble and generous nature. The second part—we think by far the more interesting and the better—is a picture, or rather series of pictures, most truthful and graphic, of the life of a New-England village in the last century. The school-house, the meeting-house, the parsonage, the minister, the schoolmistress and the master of the district school, the sexton, indeed all the localities, scenes, and characters, are wrought into the pictures each in its place, and with its own tone and coloring, and all so well drawn, that they seem to address our eyes and ears, and mingle themselves with our own experience. We heartily commend this volume to all who love genuine and truthful description, confident that no one will begin it without reading it to the close, nor without cherishing a feeling of gratitude to its gifted author.

Memorials of the Life and Trials of a Youthful Christian in pursuit of Health, as developed in the Biography of Nathaniel Cheever, M. D. By Rev. HENRY T. CHEEVER, author of "The Whale and his Captors," &c. With an Introduction, by Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D. D. New-York: Charles Scribner, 145 Nassau-street. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 355.

This is a biographical sketch of the brief earthly career of a true-hearted, devoted Christian, delineated by one of his brothers, and introduced to the public by another—a united and worthy memorial of fraternal affection, hallowed and deepened by that larger love, that knows no ties of blood, but makes all men members of one great household and the expectants of a common heavenly home. It is a book eminently fitted to do good, as a truthful record of Christian experience and the great lessons it teaches, of the wonderful power of Christian faith and hope to sustain and purify and elevate the soul in the midst of illness and suffering and manifold disappointments; to develop under such circumstances the noblest virtues and graces of human character, and to train up and ripen a human spirit for the glory and holiness of Heaven. Especially may its thoughtful perusal be of most salutary influence to the young, in checking a tendency to an all-engrossing worldliness, in repressing too ambitious longings for earthly distinction, and in holding out strong incentives to a life of Christian excellence.

Notices of Public Libraries in the United States of America. By CHARLES C. JEWETT, Librarian of the Smithsonian Institution. Printed by order of Congress, as an Appendix to the Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. Printed for the House of Representatives. 1851. 8vo. Pp. 207.

It is a fortunate circumstance that the place of Librarian in a National Institution, like the Smithsonian, designed to be, as it will doubtless become,

a central establishment in this country for all that pertains to bibliography and to the conduct of libraries, is filled by one so admirably fitted for it; by a gentleman, who not only combines eminent business talent with literary tastes and culture, but has also a distinctively professional education, gained by foreign study and travel, and by the inspection of all the leading libraries and literary institutions of Europe. Very much is to be hoped from Prof. Jewett's labors in this important department of the Smithsonian Institution; and we have what we may consider the first fruits in the present volume. It is a comprehensive and most valuable collection of historical and descriptive notices, statistics, and special details, gathered together with immense pains, in pursuance of a well-organized plan, concerning all the various public libraries in this country. We see this work referred to as authority in the leading library journal of Germany, *Petzholdt's Anzeiger*, usw. for 1850. We understand that Prof. Jewett's original and most ingenious plan for cataloguing, which was first submitted to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, has received the sanction of the commission of librarians and scholars, which was appointed to examine it, and that it will probably soon be put into practical execution.

A History of the English and Scotch rebellions of 1685. By JULIA W. H. GEORGE. New-York: Published by Cady & Burgess. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 283.

A well-written narrative of the risings in Scotland and England, headed by Argyle and Monmouth, which preceded by only three years the great English Revolution of 1688. The author seems to have consulted diligently the best sources, and she has told the history of these popular, though unsuccessful movements, in a simple and earnest style, which indicates clear and true views, and a hearty interest in the subject. The unhappy career of Monmouth, and his motives and character, are well delineated, along with all the principal events and persons connected with a cause no less just than that of the Revolution which followed it.

Scenes and Legends of the North of Scotland. By HUGH MILLER, author of "The Old Red Sandstone," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 436.

The numerous admirers of Hugh Miller may here meet this author on purely literary ground. In his scientific works he has managed, by his charming style, and his wonderful power of description, to attract to his pages many general readers, while he has commanded the admiration of naturalists and theologians, and won for himself a place among the first geologists of the age. From those fields of science in which he has reaped so rich a fame, he has now passed to the domain of literature, and entered a department, congenial to his fine natural endowments, and his early education, and his cherished tastes and habits. In the scenes and legends of the North of Scotland, a country proverbially rich in chronicle and romantic story, he has found ample scope for his imagination, his fresh and genial nature, for his habits of observation and reflection, and his sincere religious spirit. He has traced down the traditionary history of the North of Scotland from the distant and misty past, and wrought into warm and lively forms a vast amount of

material illustrating the manners and customs, the beliefs and superstitions, and the types of character, of the Scottish people. This volume will doubtless gain for its author a still larger circle of readers, and add another laurel to his well-earned fame.

The Natural History of the Human Species, its Typical Forms, &c. Illustrated by numerous engravings. By Lieut-Col. CHAS. HAMILTON SMITH, President of the Devon and Cornwall Nat. Hist. Society, &c. With a preliminary abstract of the views of Blumenbach, Pritchard, Bachman, Agassiz, and other authors, by S. KNEELAND, Jr., M. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 423.

This work maintains, on the now much disputed question of the origin of mankind, the theory of a plurality of distinct species: a theory which, notwithstanding the sanction it has received from high scientific authorities, it seems to us scarcely possible to reconcile, in any of its forms, with the teachings of the Scriptures. The writer contends for three species or typical forms of mankind, produced by nature at different centres and at different epochs. These types are the tropical, originating in the intertropical regions of Africa; the Mongolic, in north-eastern Asia; and the Caucasian, in the mountain ranges of the south and west of Asia. The author writes like a man of learning, entirely in the interest of science, and in a tone and from a point of view purely scientific; and he communicates the results of long-continued study and observation in a clear, straightforward, and manly style. The introduction to this American edition, written by Dr. Kneeland, covers ninety-eight pages of the volume, and presents, in a brief and concise form, the views of the most eminent naturalists on the question of the origin of the race. This introduction is, at the present time, most opportune, and is of great value for general, and, also, for scientific readers; it is well worth the price of the volume.

Alban: A Tale of the New World. By the Author of "Lady Alice." New-York: G. P. Putnam. 1851.

This is a book of which the less said the better for the public taste and morals. Criticism only gives it a kind of factitious importance, and hinders it a little from quietly sinking into oblivion.

Louis's School Days. A Tale for Boys. By E. J. MAY. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1852.

A delightful story of school life and experience, somewhat in the manner of Miss Edgeworth's "Frank," but pervaded, as that popular book is not, by a deep religious spirit. It is an excellent Christmas book for boys.

Another gift-book, issued by the same house, is *The Legends of the Flowers*. By SUSAN PINDAR. It is furnished with illustrations, and is most attractive, both within and without, and is a little gem of a book for small children.

Baptismal Tracts for the Times. The Design of Baptism viewed in its relation to the Christian Life. By IRA CHASE, D. D. With an appendix; to which are added several articles, occasioned by Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, and the Dogma of Baptismal Regeneration. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 12mo. Pp. 194.

The leading tract in this collection is the well-known sermon of Dr. Chase, on the Design of Baptism, delivered before the Boston Baptist Association, in 1828. Appended to it, are several learned and valuable notes, illustrative of important points in the discourse, or connected with its subject. The added articles are, on the meaning of the phrase, "regenerated unto God," in Irenæus, by Dr. Chase; on the representations concerning baptism in Dr. Robinson's Lexicon of the New Testament, by Dr. Ripley; on the sufficiency of water for baptizing at Jerusalem, and elsewhere in Palestine, as recorded in the New Testament, by Rev. G. W. Samson; a brief statement of the best established results at which biblical interpreters have arrived concerning infant baptism, by Dr. Hackett; and the importance of understanding the design of baptism, suggested in a sketch relative to the dogma of baptismal regeneration, by Dr. Chase.

It is said of John Jacob Astor, that on being informed by a friend who had retired from business on a half a million, of the fact of his retirement and of the amount of his wealth, Mr. Astor added, "Well, I don't know but a man who has half a million is as well off as if he were rich." We think much in the same way of these Baptismal Tracts. The possessor of these is as well off as if his library were filled with books on the subject. If we were to suggest an addition, it would be Dr. Ripley's examination of Dr. Woods, which appeared in our last number. There is scarcely a point in the whole controversy which is not here touched, and concerning which there is not an adequate amount of information furnished, for ordinary purposes. We thank Dr. Chase for the collection, and the publishers for the exceedingly beautiful style in which it appeared.

Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, from A. D. 1707, to A. D. 1807; being the first one hundred years of its existence. Edited by A. D. Gillette, A. M. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 8vo. Pp. 468.

The Philadelphia Association is the oldest of the Baptist Associations in this country. At its origin somewhat incompletely organized, and with imperfect records for some years, it at length assumed a more compact form, and gave more attention to the character and perpetuation of its minutes. The minutes of 1769 were the first which appear to have been printed by order of the Association, and by this time they seem to have assumed very nearly the form which is now common. In 1843, the Association appointed a committee to collect its early minutes for publication. In 1846, Rev. A. D. Gillette reported that this had been done with a large measure of success, and with as much success as was practicable. The Association now ordered the printing of the minutes of the first one hundred years, and appointed the Rev. A. D. Gillette editor. The Rev. H. G. Jones, D. D., was requested to prepare a preface, and it was ordered that the Centennial Sermon of the Rev. Samuel Jones, D. D., delivered in 1807, be added to the volume. The result is, the volume now before us. We welcome it with sincere pleasure. We

thank the editor and the committee for their patient labors, and the association for their judicious and liberal regard to the history of our denomination. The curious questions of church order which came up, the questions of doctrinal theology which were discussed, and the methods of business pursued, illustrate most strikingly the character of the Baptist fathers of those days. It is not in our power to follow the progress of these records in this notice, but we cannot refrain from expressing a wish that our readers, who may be interested in our denominational history, will possess themselves of this valuable book. It is printed in superior style.

Appleton's Dictionary of Machines, Mechanics, Engine-work, and Engineering.

Illustrated with four thousand engravings on wood. In two volumes. Vol. II. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. Imperial 8vo. Pp. 960.

We have, on a previous occasion, directed the attention of our readers to this great work. The style of surpassing accuracy and beauty in which its illustrations, and, indeed, the whole mechanical execution of the work, appear, is but an index of the pains-taking and expenses which have been bestowed on its editorial preparations. We have found its pages attracting and holding our attention, unpractised as we are in the departments of science and art of which it treats, and have felt that those whose avocations lie in the line of machines, mechanics, engine-work and engineering, could by no means dispense with its daily companionship. It is thorough in the science of its subjects, and perfect in its practical details and illustrations. It dignifies labor by linking it with the highest scientific investigations, and honors such investigations by connecting them with the useful arts. The subjects of which it treats are too little of a character suited to our pages, to justify extracts in illustration of its quality, and we must part with it by saying, that it is in every respect an honor to its projectors and to our country.

Fall of Poland: containing an Analytical and a Philosophical account of the causes which conspired in the ruin of that nation; together with a History of the Country from its origin. By L. C. SAXTON. Two vols., 12mo. Charles Scribner. 1851.

Two volumes of nearly six hundred pages each, in which the history, organization, social, literary and political condition of Poland are treated in separate chapters, forming a satisfactory whole out of somewhat unartistically combined parts. The subject is unquestionably one of great interest, particularly at this moment, when the past and present stand again face to face so ominously. We doubt, however, the advantages of this form of division. The parceling out of a great subject is better suited to a dictionary than to a volume for general readers. History should march straight on, and carry all that goes to form it onward with it. But still, this is a matter of taste, and many readers will, doubtless, prefer to find aristocracy, democracy, civilization, &c., each under a special rubric.

The Ladies of the Covenant. Memoirs of Distinguished Scottish Female Characters; embracing the period of the Covenant and the Persecution. By REV. JAMES ANDERSON. Redfield, Clinton Hall, New-York. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 494.

The lives of the Scottish women, who so nobly stood by their fathers and husbands in the trying period of the Covenant, have been hitherto un-

written; and the writer of the present volume has been the first to break ground in this field of literary labor. The book is an important contribution to the literature of that memorable period of Scottish history. It contains the lives of the most eminent Scottish women who supported the cause of the Covenanters, prepared from the most authentic materials, and written in a style plain and earnest, but distinguished by no special literary merit. The title of the book seems to us in bad taste. It is not the *ladies*, but the *women* of the Covenant, whose memoirs the author has written.

Rural Homes; or, Sketches of Houses suited to American Country Life, with original Plans, Designs, &c. By GERVASE WHEELER. New-York: Charles Scribner. 1851. 12mo. Pp. 298.

This seems to us an excellent book; no less practical than tasteful and elegant, written by a man of good sense and cultivated mind, who is acquainted with his subject, and knows how to teach it. We hope it will be widely read, and that its suggestions will be carried into practice; and that our towns and villages may ere long be full of those charming rural homes which the author has so happily described, and illustrated by his plans and designs.

Philosophy of the Mechanics of Nature, and the Sources and Modes of Action of Natural Motive Power. By Z. ALLEN. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 8vo.

This work deserves an extended review, rather than a brief notice. In the expectation of such a review of it for our next Number, from one fully competent to do it justice, we only call attention to it at present as a work of profound and original thought upon the fundamental questions of mechanical science, and illustrated by an immense variety of facts and experiments. Dr. Allen is not a mere student, nor is he professionally engaged in scientific pursuits; he is, on the contrary, a man of business, and constantly occupied with the cares and labors of extensive manufacturing establishments; and yet he has found time to keep up with the progress of a department that is ever and rapidly advancing, and to subject its manifold discoveries and new results to processes of original and comprehensive investigation. In looking over this stout octavo of more than eight hundred pages, we have been impressed with the industry and intellectual activity by which it has been planned and carried out, under circumstances apparently so unfavorable.

Fruits of Leisure: or Essays written in the Intervals of Business. First American from the Fourth London Edition. New-York: Anson D. F. Randolph. 12mo. Pp. 133.

We accidentally omitted to mention, in our October number, the appearance of this book, the first, we believe, bearing the imprint of a young publisher whose success will be gratifying to many friends. The book embodies the reflections of a cultivated mind in regard to the character and habits of commercial men, and furnishes a specially useful study to young men in commercial life, whose characters and habits are in process of formation. The essays are brief, and are precisely fitted to intervals of business. They embrace such subjects as Practical Wisdom, Contentment, our Judgments of other Men, the Education of a Man of Business, the Choice and Manage-

ment of Agents, the Treatment of Applicants, Councils, Party Spirit, Truth.

Messrs. D. APPLETON & Co's Gift Books for the present season are fully equal, and perhaps superior in literary and artistic merit, to their issues of former years. Among them is worthy of special notice, *The Women of Early Christianity: A Series of Portraits, with descriptions by several American clergymen*. Edited by Rev. J. A. SPENCER, M. A. This is a series of seventeen engravings, accompanied by biographical descriptions, and executed from original designs expressly for the work, and intended as portraits of eminently pious women of the early ages of Christianity. We scarcely know of any recent work containing a like number of original illustrations of so high an order of merit; they are engravings executed on steel in line and stipple, from designs of eminent French artists, which are finely conceived and drawn with accuracy and elegance. Embodying in personal and lifelike forms the saintly and heroic virtues of the Christian female martyrs, they impressively teach and commend that holy religion by which such virtues were produced and nurtured. The accompanying descriptions by different American clergymen, are all of them interesting, and some are highly finished biographical sketches. We are glad that this part of the work was entrusted to men who, honoring all that is genuine and good in the past, and yet having no undue reverence for ecclesiastical tradition, have sought to distinguish in their narratives between truth and fiction. We have read with great interest the sketch of Felicitas, by Dr. Sprague; of St. Agnes, by Mr. Osgood, and of Monica, by Dr. Adams. The editor, Rev. Mr. Spencer, so far from needing to cherish the apprehensions expressed in his modest preface, has, in our judgment, done a good service in editing this volume. We commend this splendid gift-book to all who love to contemplate the beautiful in art, and the purity and heroism displayed in the lives and the death of the women who adorn the early ages of the Christian Church.

Another illustrated work, from the press of the Messrs. Appleton, is *The Land of Bondage*, by Rev. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D. D. This is a journal of a tour in Egypt, and contains descriptions of Alexandria, Cairo, Thebes, a voyage down the Nile, and the Pyramids; all written in a style generally earnest and grave, but not wanting in liveliness, and abounding in reflections and allusions, which indicate the thoughtful habits, and the observant and cultivated mind, of a clergyman and a scholar. The work is embellished with twenty beautiful illustrations, and the whole volume is a worthy pendant to Dr. Wainwright's earlier work, "The Pathways and Abiding-places of our Lord."

Messrs. ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS have published a comprehensive and valuable work, as an aid to family devotions, entitled, *Family Worship: A Series of Prayers for every Morning and Evening throughout the Year, adapted to Domestic Worship*. The work is the united production of one hundred and eighty clergymen of the Church of Scotland, and was undertaken and carried through from the laudable motive of promoting the sacred duty of family worship, by furnishing, for the use of heads of families, a great variety of prayers, suited to the varying wants and circumstances of a Christian household. We hope that this volume, the monument of ministerial piety and fidelity, may, by a wide circulation, promote also in this country the great end which it was designed to secure in Scotland.

From the same publishers we have received, *The Rainbow in the North: A short account of the first establishment of Christianity in Rupert's Land by the Church Missionary Society*; by S. TUCKER.

This is an interesting narrative of the establishment and progress of a Protestant mission among the North American Indians, within the limits of the lands of the Hudson's Bay Company, in New Britain. The mission was first established in 1820, and though for some time it labored under manifold difficulties, yet, by the blessing of God attending the self-denying labors and prayerful efforts of the missionaries, it has met with the most encouraging success. It has now connected with it, a bishop, styled the bishop of Rupert's Land, seven stations with eight clergymen, and two places superintended by native catechists. Other positions are soon to be occupied. It is a most delightful fact, mentioned by the author in the conclusion of his narrative, that the first Indian boy, taught by the first missionary, in 1820, "the short and simple prayer, Great Father, teach me for Jesus Christ's sake," was in December, 1850, ordained as a herald of salvation to his countrymen. This little volume is a valuable accession to the literature of Christian missions.

Olive Leaves, is the attractive and significant title of a new work of Mrs. SIGOURNEY, published by Robert Carter & Brothers. It contains a variety of pieces in prose and in poetry, tales and fragments of history, all instinct with the spirit of peace and good-will, and written in an agreeable style, and admirably suited for the entertainment and instruction of the young.

We have received various new publications, which we can, at present, only briefly mention. Messrs. Gould & Lincoln have issued a second edition of the *Christian Daily Treasury*, by Ebenezer Temple, which is already widely known as an excellent aid to private meditation on religious subjects.—The Fourth Number of *Arvine's Cyclopaedia of Literature and the Fine Arts*, has also appeared from the same press.—*Sermons for the Christian Year*; by W. H. LEWIS, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn. C. Shepherd & Co., New-York. A volume of Sermons, the genuine fruit of faithful pastoral labors, and full of impressive practical views of Christian life and duty. Though intended primarily for Episcopalians, it is adapted to the spiritual wants of Christians of all communions.—*Ruth Churchill*, or the True Protestant; by a Lady of Virginia, (C. Shepard & Co.) is the title of a tale intended to illustrate the pernicious tendencies of some of the doctrines of the Oxford tractarians. We have no objection at all to the views of the author, but would rather see them set forth in some more legitimate way than through the medium of fiction. The difficulty with this whole class of works is, that, *mutatis mutandis*, they will prove, just as well, precisely opposite theological views.—*Christian Aspects of Faith and Duty*. Discourses by JOHN JAMES TAYLOR, B. A. New-York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1851.—*Life of a Vagrant*; or the testimony of an Outcast to the value and truth of the Gospel. New-York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1852.—*Catechetical Theology, for Youth*; especially of Bible Classes and Sabbath Schools. By JOHN FORD, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Parsippany, New-Jersey. New-York: M. W. Dodd. 1851.—*The Gospel Harmony*. By WALTER KING, A. M. New-York: M. W. Dodd. 1851. A very useful Harmony of the Gospels for the use of Sunday Schools. It is highly recommended by Rev. Albert Barnes.—*The Typology of Scripture*, or Doctrine of Types, investigated in its principles. By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, of Salton. Two vols. in one; 8vo. Philadelphia: Daniels & Smith. 1852.

ART. IX.—LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

UNITED STATES.

It is a most gratifying circumstance, that the Rev. Dr. Wayland has acceded to the request of the Executive Committee of the Missionary Union, to write the Life of Dr. Judson. The Christian public have now the prospect of being soon furnished with an authentic and authorized Memoir, written upon the basis of family letters and papers, and the official documents of the Union, which will form a worthy and enduring monument of the life, labors, and character of this devoted missionary. This task could not have fallen into better hands. Dr. Wayland is eminently fitted for its performance, by his personal acquaintance with the deceased, his intimate knowledge of the rise and progress of the Burman mission, and by his deep, long-continued interest in the missionary enterprise. We shall await with the utmost interest the publication of this biography.

We have received the first number of a new Monthly, called the *Southern Repertory and College Review*, and edited jointly by the faculty of Emory and Henry College, Virginia. It is to be chiefly devoted to the interests of education. The articles in this first number are full of life and spirit, and give evidence of tact and skill, and of sound intelligent views on education.

The number of students entered at the different Colleges the present year is larger than usual. *Brown University* commences the second year of its new organization with every appearance of increasing prosperity. Some additions and changes appear in the list of the faculty. Rev. Robinson P. Dunn, A. M., has entered upon his duties, as Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature, and Mr. S. S. Greene, A. M., as Professor of Didactics. Abraham Payne, Esq., of Providence, has been appointed Lecturer in History, and Mr. James O. Murray, Instructor in Greek, in the absence of Professor Gammell and of Professor Boise, who are now in Europe. The number of new students admitted to the different classes is ninety-two. The summary is as follows:—Resident graduates, 2; undergraduates of four years' standing, 34; of three years' standing, 31; of two years' do., 42; of one do., 61; students pursuing a select course, 55. Total, 225. Candidates for the degree of A. M., 118; of A. B., 33; of B. P., 19. The Catalogue of *Waterville College* shows in its summary a large accession—it is as follows: Seniors, 11; Juniors, 26; Sophomores, 13; Freshmen, 38. Total, 88. We have received no official accounts from the *Rochester University*; but we understand that its prospects are most flattering—that the new year has opened with a large addition of students, and that the sum contributed to its endowment has reached \$200,000. Of the *Lewisburg University* we have seen no Catalogue, but we learn from private sources that it is in a flourishing condition. *Madison University* has an addition to its several departments of 47 students. Dr. Taylor has entered upon his duties as President. The Catalogue of *Harvard College* exhibits some new appointments in the list of officers: Francis J. Child, A. M., Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory; George M. Lane, P. D., University Professor of Latin; James Jennison, A. M., Tutor in History, and Instructor in Elocution; Thomas Chase, A. M., Tutor in History; Josiah P. Cooke, A. M., Erving Professor of Chemistry and

Mineralogy; Charles F. Choate, A. B., Tutor in Mathematics. The following is the summary: I. Professional Students and Resident Graduates: Theological Students, 27; Law Students, 104; Medical, 116; Scientific Students, 69; Resident Graduates, 6. II. Undergraduates: Seniors, 81; Juniors, 85; Sophomores, 71; Freshmen, 67. Total, 626. In the Catalogue of the *Wesleyan University*, the name of Rev. John M. Clintock, D. D., (the able Editor of the *Methodist Quarterly*,) appears as President elect. The summary shows: Seniors, 24; Juniors, 24; Sophomores, 41; Freshmen, 28. Total, 117. From the Catalogue of *Amherst College*, we copy the summary as follows: Seniors, 43; Juniors, 43; Sophomores, 41; Freshmen, 63. Total, 190. *University of Vermont*: Seniors, 13; Juniors, 34; Sophomores, 35; Freshmen, 25. *Dartmouth College*: Senior Sophisters, 63; Junior Sophisters, 49; Sophomores, 67; Freshmen, 58. Total, 237. Medical Students, 45. We have not received Catalogues from other Colleges.

Mr. Lewis Colby, of New-York, has in press the *Epistle of James*, practically explained by Dr. Augustus Neander, translated from the German by Mrs. H. C. Conant: to be printed uniform with Neander on *Philippians*, by the same publisher. Mr. Colby will also publish immediately An *Exposition of the First Epistle of John*, by Neander, prepared for the press by the author, but published since his death.

Messrs. Blanchard & Lea, Philadelphia, have just reprinted a new English work, entitled *History of Greek Classical Literature*, by the Rev. R. W. Browne, Professor of Classics in King's College, London. They have in press, *Excerpta ex Q. Horatii Flacci Poematibus*, another volume of their "Schmitz and Zumpt's Classical Series," published originally by the Chambers, Edinburgh.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed & Fields, will soon publish *The Snow Image and other Stories*, by Nathaniel Hawthorne; *Life of Lord Jeffrey*, by Lord Cockburn; *The Noonday*, by James R. Lowell; and the *Memoir and Writings of Hartley Coleridge*.

Messrs. James Munroe & Co., Boston, have just published a classical work, for some time expected, entitled *The Philippics of Demosthenes*, with notes, critical and explanatory, by Professor M. J. Smead, Ph. D., William and Mary's College, Va. We have not seen the work, but expect to find it a valuable book for the use of colleges. The same publishers are issuing an edition of *Shakespeare*, founded on the Chiswick edition, and edited by Rev. H. N. Hudson, A. M.

Messrs. Gould & Lincoln have just issued *Novelties of the New World*; or the Adventures and Discoveries of the First Explorers of North America, by Joseph Banvard. This is the second volume of the series of American Histories, to which we referred in our last number, and which promises to be one of the most useful and popular series ever published.—*The Excellent Woman*, as described in the *Book of Proverbs*, with an introduction by William B. Sprague, D. D., embellished with numerous engravings; also, *The Island Home*; or the Young Castaways. Edited by Christopher Romaunt, Esq.

Dr. Hackett's *Commentary on the Acts* has appeared, from the publishing house of John P. Jewett & Co., Boston. A notice of it, prepared for our pages by a competent hand, was received too late for insertion in the present number. It is a work characterized by great learning, and careful and earnest research, and constitutes, perhaps, as important a contribution to Biblical literature as has of late been given to the world. Since its publication, Dr. Hackett has embarked for Europe and the Holy Land, to be absent about one year.

The closing of the year 1851, witnessed an unusual issue of gift-books for the Holidays; and some of them deserve special mention, for the judgment and taste with which they have been prepared. Mr. Putnam has published a very superb quarto, entitled *The Home Book of the Picturesque*, in which are fur-

nished several very fine engravings of American landscapes, with letter-press from the pens of Irving, Cooper, Dr. Bethune, Mr. Magoon, and others. He has published likewise, *The Home Book of Beauty*, a work of similar elegance, containing portraits of twelve New-York ladies, the letter-press by Mrs. Kirkland.

The Messrs. Appleton have published *Christmas Carols*, and *Lyrics of the Heart*, besides new editions of the very elegant volumes which they have produced for the holidays of preceding years.

Among the late publications of the same house, we observe, with pleasure, a new edition of Arnold's *History of Rome*, three volumes in one. The intelligent reader will hardly be satisfied without possessing, and frequently using, all the works of this most excellent author.

Mr. E. H. Fletcher has issued, in three small volumes, neatly executed, Dr. Hague's *Conversational Commentaries on Matthew, John, and the Acts*. These Commentaries are so constructed as to serve as question-books for Sunday schools and Bible classes; and the questions are very happily adapted to stimulate investigation and to awaken reflection in the scholar's own mind. We think these books without equals in their department.

The library of the late Rev. Dr. Jarvis, of Middletown, Connecticut, has been recently sold at auction in New-York. The spacious rooms of Messrs. Lyman and Rawdon were visited during the eleven consecutive evenings of the sale, by large numbers of literary and professional men, attracted thither by the celebrity of the library, perhaps the most valuable private collection in this country, and certainly the most valuable ever offered at auction to an American public. It consisted of upwards of ten thousand volumes, mostly folios and quartos, and was collected by Dr. Jarvis during his long residence abroad. Although selected with reference to his profession, and more especially with reference to that department of it which he made his particular study, viz., Ecclesiastical History and Antiquities, it nevertheless contained many standard works in the various departments of General History, Biography, Travels, Bibliography, Jurisprudence, Chronology, Philology, etc. The list of the Classics which it presented was particularly rich and inviting; many of the choicest of them came from the library of Gibbon, and contained his book-mark. The whole amount of the sale, including a fine gallery of paintings also belonging to Dr. Jarvis, was not far from \$23,000, being about half the original cost. Some of the books, notwithstanding, brought extraordinary prices, the bidders exhibiting some of that Bibliomania so characteristic of English Bibliopologists at similar sales in London and Oxford. Such, for example, were two octavo volumes of tracts, containing the American Whig, etc., purchased by George Bancroft for \$22 75; Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, (Gibbon's copy,) an ordinary sized octavo volume, purchased by Dr. Hughes for \$20 50; Peter Martyr's Decades, a small black letter quarto, purchased by Mr. Murphy for \$22; Creuxii Historia Canadensis, a small quarto volume, also purchased by George Bancroft for \$22; Byzantine Historiæ Scriptores, a unique set in 40 volumes folio, containing a beautiful manuscript translation of the third volume of Nicephorus Gregoras, was sold to Professor Ticknor of Boston for \$475. The principal purchasers throughout the sale were the Rev. Dr. Haight of the General Theological Seminary, New-York, and Mr. Guild, the librarian of Brown University. Both of these institutions have therefore received large and valuable accessions to their libraries. Harvard University, Yale College, Trinity College, Columbia College, Union College, Union Theological Seminary, Andover and Newton Theological Seminaries, New-York State Library, Historical Society of New-York, Smithsonian Institution, and various other Literary and Theological Institutions, were represented upon this occasion by professors or agents. Some of the most valuable of the folio Bibles, including the celebrated Complutensian and Antwerp Polyglotts, were purchased by Professor Conant and Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss for Rochester University. This institution, although of but yesterday's growth,

has already taken her place by the side of our oldest similar institutions, through the wisdom and enlightened management of its directors. Before many years we shall expect to see it in the possession of a library of which any college might be proud. Among the many clergymen present at the sale, were the Rev. Samuel Osgood, to whom the library of Brown University is so much indebted for its invaluable collection of Patristic works, and the Rev. William R. Williams, D. D., who carried away some of the choice treasures of the Jarvis library to enrich his own private collection.

Norton's Literary Advertiser has, by the spirit and enterprise of the publisher, Mr. C. B. Norton, New-York, gradually grown from small beginnings into a monthly sheet of considerable size and compass, handsomely printed, and full of useful matter. It is in plan somewhat like the German *Literarisches Centralblatt*, containing brief notices of new books, complete monthly lists of new American and European works, and an advertising sheet. We understand that the editor has secured valuable editorial labor for the next year, and has made considerable outlays, with the determination of making the journal still more useful. We hope he will be encouraged by a large accession to his subscription list. It is a very serviceable journal for libraries, colleges, and all literary institutions.

ENGLAND.

We learn from the London Athenæum that New College, St. John's Wood, a new institution of the Independent Dissenters, was opened in October last for the admission of students, and for the academical work of the institution. This college has been formed by combining in one, three previously existing institutions—namely, Homerton, Coward and Cheshunt Colleges; and we have no doubt that this concentration of talent and resources will contribute greatly to promote the interests of education among the English Independents. The college building is described as one of the finest of the metropolis, of the London style of architecture, with a front of 250 feet in length, and a tower in the centre, under which is the chief entrance; it contains ten lecture-rooms, a library, a museum, a laboratory, and a residence for the Principal. The following is the list of officers: Rev. John Harris, D. D., Principal, and Professor of Theology; Dr. William Smith, (well known as the editor of the series of Classical Dictionaries,) Professor of Classical Literature; Mr. Philip Smith, Professor of Mathematics; Mr. Godwin, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy; Dr. Lankester, Professor of Natural History; Mr. Nenner, Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature.

The same English journal mentions, that "the *Westminster and Foreign Quarterly Review* has passed into the hands of the publisher, Mr. John Chapman." This Review will therefore be supported by that pseudo-philosophic and most superficial and skeptical clique of English writers, who have outgrown all faith in the Christian religion, and even in the existence of a personal God. Carlyle's last book, the *Life of Sterling*, is full of the irreverence and scoffing infidelity of this English school, as well as their affectation and mannerism, qualities in which Carlyle, notwithstanding his constant talk about cant, certainly can boast of carrying the palm not only in this school, but over all the English writers of the day. We observe some timely remarks on this change in the *Westminster* in the New-York *International Magazine*, a journal whose value and influence are constantly increasing. Some of these remarks we quote. "The *Westminster Review*, failing of an adequate support, was about to be discontinued, when John Chapman, the infidel publisher, bought it, and John Stuart Mill was engaged to be its editor. We hope the respectable portion of the American journals will make haste to disclose its present character, that Christian parents will no longer receive it into their houses; and that the characteristic dishonesty of attempting to smuggle writ-

ings of philosophical quacks and mountebanks under a once reputable name, will have its appropriate reward."

Among the works recently published in England are the following: *Man and his Migrations*, by R. G. Latham, M. D.; *The Results of Comparative Philology in reference to Classical Scholarship*, by G. Curtius, translated by Dr. F. H. Trithen; *Outlines of Universal History*, translated from the German of Dr. George Weber, by Dr. M. Behr; *Sindh, and the Races that Inhabit the Valley of the Indus*, by Lieut. Richard F. Burton; *Letters on the Physics of the Earth*, by H. Buff, edited by Dr. A. W. Hoffman; *A Tour in South Africa*; with Notices of Natal, Mauritius, Ceylon, Egypt and Palestine, by Rev. J. J. Freeman, Home Secretary of the London Missionary Society. Among the announcements are the following: The Chevalier Bunsen on *Hippolytus and his Age*; *Wesley and Methodism*, by Isaac Taylor; *Lectures on the History of France*, delivered before the University of Cambridge, by Sir James Stephen; *An Illustrated Classical Mythology and Biography*, post 8vo., by Dr. William Smith; *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, by Dr. Smith, (Part I. in December;) *The Germania of Tacitus*, with Ethnological Dissertations and Notes, by Dr. R. G. Latham; *Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham and his Contemporaries*, by the Right Honorable the Earl of Albemarle; *Personal Recollections of Mary Russell Mitford*, by Mary Russell Mitford; *History of the War in Afghanistan, from Unpublished Letters and Journals, &c.*, by John William Kaye; *Memoirs of the late Emperor of China and the Court of Peking*, by the late Dr. Gutzlaff; *Lieutenant-General Sir Charles Napier's Administration in the Scinde*, by Major-General Sir William Napier; The third volume of Merivale's *History of the Romans under the Empire*.

GREECE.

From a valued correspondent we have received the following communication from Athens:

The present condition of education in Greece is in many respects encouraging. The first institution of learning in the country is the University of Athens. A large and handsome edifice, not containing dormitories, but devoted to lecture-rooms, the library, and scientific purposes, is now completed, and stands just at the foot of Mt. Lycabettus, facing the Acropolis. The internal organization is after the model of a German university, with the exception that no tuition fees are charged. The board of instruction is divided into the four faculties of Law, Medicine, Divinity, and Philosophy, and the several instructors are distinguished either as ὑφηγηταί, (*privatim docentes*,) τακτικοὶ καθηγηταί (*professores ordinarii*,) or ἑκτακτοὶ καθηγηταί, (*professores extraordinarii*.) The university has at present about three hundred regular students, besides many who are not candidates for a degree; and between forty and fifty instructors. These latter have for the most part been educated in Germany, and have brought with them the system of instruction with which they have there become familiar. In this way, far more than through the present reigning family, is the influence of Germany exerted in moulding the character of the youthful kingdom of Greece. The library of the university contains about 60,000 volumes. These have, for the most part, been presented by wealthy Greeks, resident in other countries of Europe, or by German libraries which had duplicates. On the hill of the Nymphs stands a good astronomical observatory, under the direction of Dr. Bouris.

A university has also been established in the Ionian Islands, at Corfu. This university is organized more after the English than the German plan. The president, George F. Bowen, M. A., is an Oxford scholar. This gentleman is author of an interesting work on the island of Ithaca. The library contains a very good collection of the Greek fathers, but in most departments of literature is rather deficient.

Five gymnasia, somewhat after the German model, have been established at different points in the kingdom of Greece, and are now in successful operation.

A polytechnic school has not long since been established at Athens, and contains about two hundred pupils. It is sad, however, to walk through its apartments, and contrast the elegant, though soiled and fractured pieces of ancient workmanship, the productions of unrivalled genius, with the imperfect and labored imitations of modern Grecian art. Greece was once the teacher of Italy, not to say of the world, but the principal artist in the modern polytechnic school is an Italian; and the children of the once peerless Athens sit willingly at the feet of strangers whose ancestors in former days came hither only as learners. Yet humbled as her children now are, Athens has not yet wholly lost her empire over the world of art; for the fragments of her ancient workmanship, a broken capital, a hand or foot of an ancient statue, wherever found, is still copied and carefully studied as an inimitable model. The Parthenon, too, and the Propylæa, though in melancholy ruin, and despoiled by the hands of barbarians age after age, still preserve enough of their original proportions to suggest the entire outline; and those structures, which, like Athens herself, sprang at once in full perfection into being, remain after so many ages as the finest ideals of architectural beauty.

Perhaps the most interesting indication of improvement among the Greeks, is the great change which has taken place in public opinion within a few years, respecting female education. This change may be traced quite directly to the influence of American missionaries. When our countrymen, Messrs. Hill and King, the former under the patronage of the Episcopal Missionary Society, the latter under that of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, first came to Greece and opened schools for the instruction of girls as well as boys, they were not only viewed with suspicion, but their plans were considered ridiculous. It was not long, however, before the benefits of such education became apparent; and at the present moment I am sitting almost under the shadow of an immense and elegant edifice, which the Greeks themselves have nearly completed for the purpose of establishing a ladies' boarding school. Dr. King abandoned his school a considerable time ago, and has since devoted himself more exclusively to the work of preaching; but Mr. Hill still continues this branch of his philanthropic labors with the most happy success.

Between twenty and thirty newspapers are published in Athens. A considerable number of these are, however, only reprints of foreign papers, chiefly French. In this way French political and philosophical ideas are unhappily too much disseminated among the Greeks. Much more freedom is allowed here to the newspaper press than in other parts of Europe, with the exception of France and England; and this freedom is in too many cases used in finding fault with the government. Foolish and impolitic as the present administration doubtless is, (and of what German government may the same not be said,) there is, nevertheless, a species and a degree of complaint which works no good, but only evil. Nor would it probably be easy for the wisest and best ruler to satisfy all the demands of the Greeks. A little less fault-finding on the one side, a little wiser application and direction of the resources of the country on the other, and a little more enterprise on both sides, might very profitably take the place of mutual recrimination.

A periodical devoted to archaeology, and conducted with considerable ability, appears occasionally at Athens. Aside from this, no important literary or scientific periodical is now published in Greece. Comparatively few books are as yet printed, and these are chiefly translations of foreign works.

J. R. B.

Athens, Oct., 1851.

GERMANY.

A recent letter we have received from a distinguished professor in Halle, mentions a great decrease in the number of theological students at the different

universities, and ascribes the cause to the decline of religion and of interest in sacred studies, occasioned by the revolutionary movements of the past few years. Some statistics are furnished as follows :—Konigsberg had, twenty years ago, 200 students of theology ; now, it has 37. Breslau had 200 ; now 52. Berlin had over 250 ; now it has 150. Halle had, in 1830, 900 ; now it has 320. The proportional decrease at other universities is similar. On the other hand, it is a fact of importance, that those who now devote themselves to theology, do it from the outset at the impulse of genuine piety, and with the hope of being useful in the ministry.

The warm discussions which have been going on in Germany for several years, concerning the course of studies in the gymnasia, and especially concerning the relative importance of the ancient and the modern languages, have given rise to conventions of teachers, called by the government to take the whole subject into consideration, and, if necessary, to reorganize the system of gymnasia education. We find in a recent number of the *Leipsic Jahrbucher*. a report of one of those conventions held at Meissen, Saxony, Dec. 28-30, 1848. It is a very elaborate document, covering nearly 60 pages, and written by Prof. Dietsch, of Grimma. Forty teachers were present. Reports of seven committees (appointed at an earlier convention) had been previously sent in, which were on the following subjects, viz. : Ancient Languages, by Palm ; National Culture, by Dietsch ; the Mathematics and Natural Sciences, by Wunder ; the Outward Position and the Internal Arrangements of Gymnasia, and the Education and Examination of Teachers, by Kochly ; Instruction in Religion, by Lipsius ; the Study of Hebrew, by Böttcher ; the Modern Languages, by Fiebig. Out of these reports a programme of business was made up by the faculty of the Meissen Gymnasium, containing the following as the chief subjects for deliberation : the Division of the Classes of the Gymnasium, Departments of Instruction, the Outward Position of the Gymnasium and its internal Organization, and the Education, Examination, Appointment and Pensioning of Teachers. One excellent rule observed by the convention in its sittings, explains the settlement of so much business in so short a time, viz. : that ten minutes only were allowed for a speech. We extract from the mass of business transacted some of the most important decisions. It was unanimously agreed that the Gymnasium consist of nine classes, three for each of the three divisions, the lower, middle, and upper Gymnasium, and each class having a course of one year. Several important questions were decided on the relation of the modern to the ancient languages, viz. : by a vote of 32 to 8, the question, shall a priority be conceded to the modern, over the ancient languages ? was settled in the negative ; and by a vote of 21 to 18, it was decided that English should not be a required study ; also, a subsequent proposition to give the priority to French was rejected by a vote of 23 to 16. In respect to the ancient languages, the following were some of the decisions : by a vote of 25 to 11, that the Latin have no preference over the Greek, the instruction in each to be the same in compass and end ; by a vote of 20 to 17, that the speaking of Latin be done away with ; also, that special exercises in Prosody (writing of verses) be abandoned ; the prosody be learned in the Grammar, and the rules be given and practised upon, in connection with reading, and for the sake of securing correct reading.

A similar Convention of Teachers was held in Berlin, in 1849, from April 16th to 14th May, a report of which has been published, prepared by Prof. Eckstein. This report forms a large work of nearly 200 pages, (we have not the report, but infer this fact from a remark in a German Journal,) and is spoken of in the highest terms. The decisions of the Convention were conservative, asserting anew the importance of the study of the ancient languages, and establishing, as the end of such study, an acquaintance with the spirit and life of classical antiquity. We hope to receive a copy of this report, and to be able to mention, in detail, some of the results of the deliberations of the most distinguished classical teachers of Prussia, in respect to the educational wants of the times.

The Series of *Greek and Latin Writers, with German Notes*, published by Weidmann, Leipsic, under the general editorial supervision of Moritz Haupt and H. Sauppe is going rapidly forward. The publication of this series of editions of the classics for the use of the Gymnasias is an indication of a change in the views and practice of German teachers. Hitherto it has been customary for the pupils to use editions containing only the text, and for the teacher to communicate orally all that was deemed needful for the reading and interpretation of the author. It is now, however, considered necessary to an adequate preparation for the business of the class-room, that the pupils be furnished with editions, containing notes; and it is found that the best and most studious pupils are the very ones who most frequently make application to their teachers for advice concerning the editions of this class which will aid them in the right way in their private preparations. But, in the opinion of the editors of this series and of many other practical teachers, by far the larger proportion of the editions, intended for the use of students, are, on various accounts, wholly unsuitable and unpractical; in many instances, they are positively pernicious. To meet, therefore, the want often felt and expressed by the ablest and most intelligent instructors for editions of the classics constructed upon right principles, and, according to a uniform plan and method, is the object of Messrs. Haupt and Sauppe, and their coadjutors, in the publication of the series. We herewith give, in brief, the principles adopted:—1. The language of the Notes is German. (this, of course, in departure from the hitherto prevailing usage of writing notes in Latin.) 2. The various readings are not given. Only in rare instances are critical notes given, and then always brief, and only in editions for the advanced students. 3. The Notes give only what in each instance is necessary, whether in language, connection of thought, or miscellaneous matters, to the understanding of the passage. Only where a passage has peculiar difficulties, or has in it something peculiar to the author, are grammatical notes given. 4. Mere quotations are avoided as much as possible. Also, accumulations of parallel passages are avoided; but if it is necessary to refer to such a passage, and it is not in the same author, it is given in full. 5. Every note is given in the briefest form, giving only the results of the editor's own investigations, and abstaining from all controversy. 6. Every work has an introduction, which contains a view of the life and character of the author, his times, the object of the work, its value, &c. The works already published for this series are as follows:—I. Greek. *Arrian's* *Anabasis*, 2 vols. ed. by C. Sintenis, with a Map by Kiepert. *Demosthenes*, (selections,) 2 vols., by A. Westermann; 1st vol. containing the Philippics, the 2d the Oration for the Crown, and that against Septines. *Euripides*, (selections,) by Schöne. 1st vol. the *Bacchæ*, and *Iphigenia et Tauri*; 2d and 3d vols. will soon follow. *Herodotus*, by B. H. Lhardy; 1st vol. containing 1st and 2d books—2d and 3d vols. soon to appear. *Homer's Odyssey*, by J. M. Fäsi; 1st vol. books 1–12; 2d 13–24. The *Iliad* soon to follow. *Isocrates*, *Panegyricus* and *Areopagiticus*, by R. Rauchenstein. *Plutarch*, by C. Sintenis; 3 vols., 1st, *Aristides* and *Cato Major*; 2d, *Agis* and *Cleomenes*; 3d, *Themistocles* and *Pericles*. *Sophocles*, by F. W. Schneidewin; 1st vol. *Ajax* and *Philoctetes*. To be followed by 2d and 3d. II. Latin. *Cicero*, *Brutus*, by O. Jahn; *Cato Major*, by J. Sommerbrod; *Disput. Tusc.*, by G. Tischer; *De Nat. Deorum*, by G. F. Schömann; *Selected Orations*, by K. Halm. To be in 6 vols.; 5th has appeared, containing *Pro Milone*, *Pro Ligario*, and *Pro Deiotaro*. The others to appear at intervals of six months. *Cicero's Orator*, by O. Jahn; *Cornelius Nepos*, by K. Nipperdey; *Tacitus*, in 4 vols., by Nipperdey; 1st vol. has appeared, rest to come at intervals of six months. *Virgil*, in 3 vols., by Th. Ladewig; 1st has appeared, containing *Bucolics* and *Georgics*. Rest to follow immediately. Editions of the following Greek and Latin authors are in preparation: *Lucian*, *Plato*, *Thucydides*, *Cæsar*, by Kraner; *Cicero's Lælius*, the *De Officiis*, by Unger; *De Oratore*, by Eckstein; *Horace* by Haupt; *Phædrus*, by Haupt, *Ovid*, by Haupt; *Plautus*, by Fleckeisen; *Quintilian*, lib. x., by Jacobs; *Terence*, by Sauppe.

Ecclesiastical Record.**DEATHS.**

George H. Scott, Broome Co., Ky., aged 43.	E. J. Harris, Waldoborough, Me., Oct. 7, aged 38.
Robert McAlister, Pulaski Co., Ky., Sept. 16, aged 69.	N. G. Lovell, Valley Falls, R. I., Nov. 16.
Stephen Guy, Duplin Co., N. C., Sept. 27, aged 36.	Richard Lentell, New Orleans, Sept. 24, aged 36.

ORDINATIONS.

George G. Fairbanks, Medfield, Mass., Sept. 9.	Jacob A. Wood, North Wilna, N. Y., Oct. 16.
Charles Ayer, Turner, Me., Sept. 9.	Joseph A. Bailey, Essex, Ct., Oct. 23.
A. T. Cole, Freedom, N. Y.	Adolf Hune, Newark, N. J., Oct. 23.
Ephraim S. Widdemar, Salem, N. J., Sept. 18.	William Huntley, Taylor, N. Y., Oct. 22.
Asa Dalton, Augusta, Me., Sept. 24.	W. Leggett, Owasco, N. Y., Oct. 28.
David B. Ford, Canton, Mass., Sept. 25.	Curtis Keeney, Waterbury, Ct., Oct. 29.
Robert B. Jones, Forsyth Co., N. C., Sept.	Jonathan Tilson, Hingham, Mass., Nov. 5.
John H. Caudle, Forsyth Co., N. C., Sept.	Charles A. Votey, Eng. Neighborhood, N. J., Nov. 4.
Isaac Cole, Baltimore, Md., Oct. 5.	Charles Keyser, Wallingford, Ct. Nov. 6.
George G. Gleason, Oct. 16.	Charles Swift, S. Trenton, N. Y., Nov. 6.
John M. Lyons, Glen Run, Pa., Oct. 15.	Isaac Leonard, Burlington, Iowa, Nov. 18.
L. E. Spafford, Richmondville, N. Y., Oct. 16.	Hosea Prince, West Gardiner, Me., Nov. 4.
H. S. Fish, Albion, N. Y., Oct. 13.	H. T. Vose, Springfield, Mass., Sept. 28.

CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

Bridgport, Canada West, Sept. 10.	Washington, Cambria Co., Pa., Oct. 27.
Willow Creek, Mo., Sept. 10.	Trenton, N. J., Nov. 5.
Mill Plain, (Danbury,) Ct., Sept. 24.	Williamsburgh, L. I., Oct. 16.

DEDICATIONS.

St. George, Me., Oct. 21.	North Marshfield, Mass., Nov. 19.
Brier Creek, Pa., Oct. 12.	Goshen, N. H., Nov. 12,
Morrisania, N. Y., Nov. 6.	Nashville, N. Y., Nov. 13.
Pike, N. Y., Nov. 6.	